Running Head: IDENTIFYING METHODS OF INFLUENCING

Identifying Methods of Influencing Organizational Norms, Values, Behavior and

Expectations at Rialto Fire Department

Executive Leadership

By: Jim Bruce
    Rialto Fire Department
    Rialto, California

An applied research project submitted to the National Fire Academy as part of the
Executive Fire Officer Program

October 2008

*Appendices Not Included. Please visit the Learning Resource Center on the Web at http://www.lrc.dhs.gov/ to learn how to obtain this report in its entirety through Interlibrary Loan.*

CERTIFICATION STATEMENT

I hereby certify that this paper constitutes my own product, that where the language of others is set forth, quotation marks so indicate, and that appropriate credit is given where I have used the language, ideas, expressions, or writings of another.

Signed: _____

Abstract

The problem was that RFD needed to improve its tools to prevent behaviors that discredit the department resulting in lessened economic support. The research purpose was to identify methods to instill values in RFD and guide workplace conduct. A descriptive research method was utilized including a literature review, three feedback instruments and five personal interviews. The research questions addressed: (a) customer and citizen expectations of organizational behavior, (b) employee expectations of organizational behavior, (c) adoption of organizational values and norms, (d) organizational influence of behavior, and (e) how fire departments differ from other organizations. Results indicated: (a) Customers expect quick, competent emergency response, (b) employees expect honesty, fairness and top management support, (c) organizational values and norms are adopted through socialization and rule driven processes; (d) socialization and rule driven methods influence employee behavior; and, (e) fire differ by being more traditional, assume unusual risk, value courage and receive above average public trust.  Recommendations included use of socialization methods and policy development to instill values and norms, fostering organizational honesty, ethics training, research of organizational values and norms, and assuring emergency reliability to the community.

Table of Contents

Tables

Appendices

Introduction

Many organizations utilize methods to prevent employee behaviors that can bring

discredit to their reputation (Zemke, 2003), (Drumm (2000), and Sole and Wilson (2002). Such

behaviors can result in political and economic repercussions.  The problem was that Rialto Fire

Department (RFD) had suffered reputation damage from employee behaviors that brought

discredit to the organization.  RFD needed to discover and develop appropriate methods to

prevent such future behavior in order to prevent damage to political and economic support for

RFD's mission in the community.

The research purpose was to identify methods to create and instill agreed upon values that

guide members in appropriate conduct thereby resulting in appropriate organizational behavior

that reflects positively on RFD members, co-workers, and the City of Rialto.  A descriptive

research method was utilized including a literature review.  Best industry methods of creating

and instilling agreed upon values were identified.  Three feedback instruments were developed

and sent to RFD firefighters, fire departments, and Rialto citizens.  Five experts were

interviewed via email and telephone.  This research project included the following questions: (a)

what are the customers' and citizens' expectations of organizational behavior? (b) what are the

employees' expectations of organizational behavior? (c) how are organizational values and

norms adopted? (d) how do organizations influence employee behavior? and (e) how do fire

departments differ from other organizations in the factors outlined in the previous questions?

Recommendations for RFD to create and instill agreed upon values were identified.

Background and Significance

RFD is a full service fire agency which provides fire suppression, hazardous materials response, fire prevention, paramedic advanced life support (ALS) service and ambulance transport, technical rescue, community risk reduction, arson investigation and other services. The fire jurisdiction covers 23 square miles.  Rialto's population is 105,000. RFD has four fire stations and a daily staffing of 22 suppression personnel. Daily shift staffing consists of 5 captains, 5 engineers, 2 fire-fighters, 9 fire-fighter paramedics and 1 shift battalion chief. RFD staffs four fire engines, one ladder truck, three paramedic ambulances, and a battalion chief. Engine and truck staffing is 3 personnel and paramedic ambulance staffing is 2 personnel. Administration consists of the fire chief, deputy fire chief, training battalion chief, 3 shift battalion chiefs, EMS coordinator, fire marshal, fire inspector, executive assistant to the fire chief, two accounting assistants, and a part-time mail clerk.  RFD responds to approximately 10,000 calls annually.

RFD provides service to a diverse community. The community consists of 54.2% Hispanic, 21.5% African American, 19.1 % Caucasian, 2% Asian, and 3.2% Multi-Racial (zipskinny.com, 2008).  RFD has 82 members. Two positions are currently vacant. RFD currently is 71% Caucasian, 22% Hispanic, 4% African American, 2% Multi-Racial and 1% Asian.  RFD has been criticized by some members of Council and local interest groups for not reflecting the demographics of the community it serves.  Recently, the department had to deal with a complaint of racism that resulted in investigations, discipline, arbitrations, division within RFD, bad press coverage, and a myriad of other negative consequences.  The need to instill agreed upon values to guide appropriate conduct surfaced when RFD was faced with the challenge to improve internal and external relationships.

To further exacerbate the organizational behavior issues, RFD is a relatively young department.  In 1999, RFD experienced severe budget problems resulting in laying off a division chief position, eliminating an assistant fire marshal position, eliminating a disaster coordinator position, and laying off two office staff members.  In addition, the fire department was forced to shut down its' ladder truck and close one of its' four fire stations.  In the course of 18 months, RFD lost 45 members, 8 of which were captains to surrounding fire departments.  The rest of Southern California was experiencing an economic boom and many better paying, secure fire service jobs were available.  As a result, to fill the gap, lesser experienced first line supervisors were appointed and numerous new employees were hired. In turn, the result of this change created enormous strain on the organizational culture.

Rialto passed an 8% utility users tax in 2003.  This measure passed in 2003 by 5 votes. It provides $14 million to the general fund.  The tax was reconfirmed overwhelmingly in 2008 with 65% of the voters supporting the measure. The measure was placed before voters a month after the 2008 fire season which was severe in California. In San Bernardino County, where Rialto is located, numerous structures were lost and over 100,000 acres burned. The tax is up for renewal in 2013.  The possibility of upsetting a diverse community is significant.  In addition, some behaviors not only violate policy but state and federal laws. Also, such behavior frequently generates significant lawsuits and damages award.

The potential damage to RFD's mission and potential loss of economic support, political damage,  and discredit to its' reputation in a diverse community necessitated the need for RFD to identify methods that organizations utilize to influence positive organizational behavior. Brunacini (Personal communication, January 18, 2006) speaks of the need for fire departments to prevent incidents that result in the department's image of going from hero to zero in one lap or

experiencing a moment of truth event.  RFD was in need of improving its organizational

behavior, internal and external customer service, fostering positive values and norms, influencing

positive employee behavior, and fostering a diversity friendly organizational culture.

This applied research project is related to the National Fire Academy (NFA) and

Executive Fire Officer Program (EFOP) course, *Executive Leadership Student Manual, Unit 7:*

*Succession/Replacement Planning,* which discusses defining competencies including

values/images, traits, and motives and the organizational barriers to developing such

competencies (Federal Emergency Management Agency [FEMA], 2005). In addition it is related

to the NFA and EFOP course *Executive Leadership Student Manual, Unit 14: Persuasion,* which

discusses the four elements of effective persuasion including credibility, common ground,

compelling evidence and connecting emotionally (FEMA, 2005). In addition, this research

project is related to the USFA *Executive Leadership Development (R123) Research Self Study*

*Workbook* (FEMA, 2004) operational objective of responding to emerging issues in a timely

manner.

<div align="center">Literature Review</div>

Business Literature Findings

For the purpose of this research paper post modernism means: "Marked by a tendency to

dismiss the possibility of any sure and settled knowledge of the truth." (MacArthur, p.10, 2007).

Post-modernism does not assert anything as true or good and embraces relativism (MacArthur,

2007).  MacArthur (2007) states that relativism postulates a subjective view of life and a denial

of every dogma. Post-modernism brings with it a relentless questioning of every axiom,

exaltation of mystery and paradox, and a commitment to every ambiguity (MacArthur, 2007).

Those who embrace certainty are labeled inherently arrogant, elitist, oppressive and always in

error (MacArthur, 2007).  Post-modern thought is suspicious of rational, logical thought and it is

not compatible with truth in propositional terms (MacArthur, 2007).

Post-modernism is applicable to a discussion of workplace values, norms, ethics, vision

and mission in the following manner.  Post modernism embraces ambiguity (MacArthur, 2007).

Outside the workplace, there is great freedom in America to view or engage in sexual banter,

racial humor, and other types of behavior that is prohibited in the workplace (R. Preciado,

personal communication, March 13, 2008). Once at work, workers are expected to avoid such

behavior (R. Preciado, personal communication, March 13, 2008). The ambiguity, relativism,

and denial of every dogma  of a post-modern culture (MacArthur, 2007) conflicts with the black

and white issues of law such as rules, regulations, policy, procedures, anti-discrimination, or

harassment laws (R. Preciado, personal communication, March 13, 2008).  Supervisors, whether

private or public, are expected to hold themselves and subordinates accountable to organization

values, rules, policies, standards and norms  that are not readily accepted outside the workplace

(R. Preciado, personal communication, March 13, 2008).  Preciado (personal communication,

March 13, 2008) recommends: (a) Supervisors recognize the difference between the outside

world and the workplace; (b) make a personal commitment to the principles of appropriate

interaction; (c) treat others with dignity, respect and professionalism; and (d) recognize,

proactively counsel, and discipline when necessary. Preciado is a risk management attorney for

Employment Risk Management Authority (ERMA), a California based corporation that provides

risk management training to municipal governments.

For the purpose of this study, the term *values* means: "those aspects of life that you hold

dear; in the world, this is known as experimental knowledge". (Sargent, p. 62, 2006.  The term

*core values* means: "These are the things on which the members of the organization refuse to

compromise" (Sargent, p. 63, 2006).  The term *norms* means: "a standard, model, or pattern considered being typical of a group" (Webster's, p. 763, 2005). Sole and Wilson (2002) researched the topic of story telling in organizations to share knowledge and found that story telling is well suited to share or convey organizational norms and values whereas communicating rules, laws and policies are not well suited for conveying such organizational knowledge. Sole and Wilson (2002) also found modeling to be excellently suited to convey organizational values and norms. Sole and Wilson (2002) stated that stories are useful to: (a) share organizational norms and values, (b) develop trust and commitment, (c) share tacit knowledge, (d) facilitate unlearning, and (e) to generate emotional connection. Sole and Wilson (2002) point out several traps of story telling include: (a) Seductiveness or the absorption into the story, diminishing critical thought; (b) single point of view; and (c) the static nature of a story or, the tendency for stories to become distanced from reality as organizational change occurs. Sole and Wilson (2002) found that stories are applicable to kick-start new ideas, socialize new members, mend relationships, and share wisdom.

CliffsNotes (2008) recommends: (a) identification of current organizational values, (b) evaluation of whether such values are right for the organization, and (c) changing employee actions and behaviors to reflect such values.  CliffsNotes (2008) recommends several methods to accomplish this including: (a) Sensitivity training - changing behavior and attitudes through unstructured interaction; (b) survey feedback - which includes assessing attitudes by use of surveys;  (c) process consultation- which involves the use of an outside consultant to assist in understanding interpersonal relationships; (d) team building - or interaction of work teams to learn about various work assignments;  and (e) intergroup development - changing sterotypes, and attitudes that workgroups have of each other.

If various values conflict (Williams, 2004), we tend to resolve such conflicts by subordinating values to the organization's core values.  Williams (2004) states that values: (a) Help with self-awareness; (b) assist with ethical decision making; (c) assist with task prioritization; and (d) assist with credibility development and building trust.  Williams (2004) points out that lateral moves within an organization reveal that different work groups often have differing values.  To foster organizational buy-in of values, Williams (2004) suggests: (a) posting values on the organization website, (b) assigning mentors to influence new managers with senior management's values, and (c) story telling to convey values. Mentoring and story telling (Williams, 2004) were also mentioned by Sole and Wilson (2002) to convey organizational norms.  In addition, Williams (2004) discusses the importance of rewarding esteemed values. Williams (2004) mentions that the use of jargon may inadvertently pass on a value that is not esteemed. Jargon (Williams, 2004) may include derogatory names for a certain type of customer or an employee's distain for a work process. Related to this, CliffsNotes (2008) mentions organizational efforts to change sterotypes.

Nelson  and Economy (2005) mention four components to developing an organization ethics code including: (a) compliance with internal policies, (b) compliance with federal and state laws and regulations, (c) guidance from organizational values, and (d) guidance from individual values. Sole and Wilson's (2002) research found that values are not adequately conveyed to employees through written policy or codes.

King, Xiao, Quick, and Sethi (2004), who researched socialization in the technology industry, found that socialization tactics assist employee values, skills, and organizational attachment. King et. al. (2004) point out that organizational socialization helps new employees transition into organizational insiders and master critical skills. King et. al. (2004) point out that

socialization practices have long lasting functional or dysfunctional consequences for employee attitudes and behaviors. Similar to William's (2004) discussion of jargon, and CliffsNotes (2008) discussion of stereotypes, King et. al. (2004) state that organization newcomers may experience reality shock when they enter an organization and are forced to reinterpret their assumptions. Organizations can confirm or disconfirm newcomer's values and behaviors that transform them into insiders or lead to their departure.

King et. al. (2004) discuss six socialization tactics including: (a) Collective - individual, which includes the degree to which new employees are trained in a group or as an individual; (b) formal-informal, which assures that new employee status is made explicit and employees are segregated from other members while they are socialized. King et. al. (2004) cited off-site training programs as an example; (c) sequential-random tactics, a requirement to pass though a series of steps to obtain full employee status, such as specialized certifications; (d) fixed-variable tactics, where new employees deal with the temporal nature of events such as the end of employee probation; (e) serial -disjunctive tactics, where employees have senior organizational employees acting as mentors or role models; and (f) investiture-divestiture tactics, where new employees' positive values such as self confidence are re-affirmed by senior members (King et. al., 2004). King et. al.'s (2004) discussion of senior employee mentors is similar to Sole and Wilson's (2002) modeling.

Robert Knowling (2000) argues that values and vision mold organizational behavior and provide a catalyst for strategic action. Knowling (2000) offers five steps for definition, articulation, and fostering organizational vision and values including: (a) Assessment of the organization, industry, and economic impact; (b) surveying new employees; (c) linking results to organization attributes and effort; (d) connection of partners, front-line employees and

customers; and (e) providing leadership for change. Similarly, CliffsNotes (2008) mentions surveying organization employees to assess organizational values.

Whitworth, K. House, H. House, and Sandahl (2007) discuss ethics in the context of coaching people towards success.  Whitworth et. al. (2007) discuss the following professional conduct ethics including: (a) Set clear cultural boundaries; (b) avoid sexual involvement with clients; (c) construct clear agreements; (d) accurately identify qualifications, expertise, and experience; (e) do not make false claims about service provision; (f) do not exploit relationship with clients for personal, professional, or monetary gain; (g) report all valid threats to authorities; and (h) respect confidentiality except as responsible by law to report.

Whitworth et .al. (2007) feel that values are not about moral character or ethics. However, Whitworth et.al. (2007)  point out that living ethically may be a value.  Whitworth et. al. (2007) point out that values are the qualities of life lived internally to externally.  Values (Whitworth et. al., 2007) are intangible assets such as adventure, learning, nature, spirituality, power, friendship, intimacy, connection, independence, and fun.  Hence, money, though not a value could be a resource to honor such values as adventure and fun (Whitworth et. al. 2007). Whitworth et. al. (2007) believe that values are what an individual is at the present time. They are the principles that one holds onto in life.

Zemke (2003) states that customers care about five service quality factors including: (a) Reliability - receiving what was promised, dependability and accuracy; (b) assurance - or the courtesy and knowledge of customer needs and the organization's ability to convey trust, competence, and confidence; (c) tangibles - including the facilities, equipment and appearance; (d) empathy - or the degree of attention and caring demonstrated; and (e) responsiveness - or the organization's willingness to help resolve customer complaints.

Zemke (2003) stresses honesty is the only policy when it comes to customer service. If there is bad news (Zemke, 2003) organizations must face the customer because tall tales get found out and customers respect honesty when things go wrong.  Zemke (2003) also points another reason for honesty; employees feel better about themselves when honesty is fostered in an organization.  Whitworth et. al. (2007) also discuss the importance of honesty in the profession of coaching.

Zemke (2003) points out that rules were meant to be broken.  Zemke (2003) further discusses how some organizations delineate red rules that cannot be broken, such as health care industry rules that exist to protect the life and well being of patients; and, blue rules which are designed to make a health care organization run more smoothly such as patient admission rules. Red rules are sometimes mandated by a government agency whereas blue rules may have evolved from employee experience of what works best (Zemke, 2003).  Employees are expected to know the difference (Zemke, 2003).

Zemke (2003) points out that trust takes a long time to build and can be destroyed by a single incident of unfaithfulness. Zemke (2003) further notes that fairness is the most critical trust-creating hot button. Zemke (2003) points out that internal or external customers feel treated fairly when: (a) they receive expected outcome, (b) there are painless processes to get what they want, (c) performance promises are kept, (d) they are treated ethically with no bait and switch tactics, and (e) their interests were placed ahead of the organization's interests.

Another point that Zemke (2003) stresses is the need for employees to do things right, which he describes as doing their jobs with skill, competence and correctness. Zemke (2003) also discusses the need to do the right thing, which he describes as deciding the best course of action in a given situation.  Zemke (2003) mentions three basic rules: (a) If the action violates a red

rule, one can stop right there; (b) if the action involves a blue rule, evaluate whether bending the

rule will allow the employee to serve a customer better; and (c) knowing who should make the

final decision.

Harvey, Cottrell and Lucia (2003) mention that a leader's ethics are always on display

and that one slip can be disastrous.  Harvey et. al.'s (2003)  code of conduct is simple including:

(a) Following all of the written rules and procedures, (b) always being truthful, (c) never

breaking a commitment or promise, (d) practicing superior quality in everything, and (e)

consistency in standing up for what's right.  Harvey et. al. (2003) mention continual feedback or

supervision, zero tolerance for ethics violations and using their simple ethics test which asks: (a)

Is the issue legal?; (b) does it comply with rules, regulations, and guidelines?; (c) does it jive

with organizational values?; (d) is there any guilt or do I feel comfortable with it?; (e) does it

support company goals, commitments, and mission?; (f) what would my family or friends think?;

(g) am I okay with it being done to me?; and (h) would the most ethical person I know do it?

Harvey et. al.'s emphasis of truthfulness is similar to Whitworth et. al's (2007) and Zemke's

(2003) discussions regarding honesty.

MacDonald (2006) states that most major corporations have developed an organizational

code of ethics to foster and encourage commitment, mission, behavior expectations, and vision.

MacDonald (2006) mentions the following processes in developing a code of ethics including:

(a) Ask what differentiates your organization from others and customize the code of ethics to fit;

(b) obtain employee input to build ownership and acceptance; (c) consult key stakeholders such

as customers, local community groups and Council; (d) consider hiring a consultant but assure

the final product reflects the organization's values, principles, and aspirations; (e) be clear as to

who is governed by the code of conduct; (f) have a specific implementation plan; (g) include

employee training and education in the implementation plan; (h) have a clear enforcement

policy; and (i) set a specific time schedule for revision and updating.  MacDonald's (2006)

discussion of employee assessment is similar to Knowling (2000) and CliffsNotes (2008)

recommendation to survey employees.  In addition, MacDonald's (2006), and CliffsNotes (2008)

mention the use of outside consultants.

Wikipedia (2006) mentions that organizational culture consists of attitudes, experiences,

beliefs, and values of an organization. Wikipedia (2006) mentions that, while senior management

may attempt to determine organizational culture, work groups develop their own behavioral

quirks. Task cultures (Wikipedia, 2006), that develop jargon and skills that are gained

independently of the organization can be imported into the organization.  A strong culture exists

(Wikipedia, 2006), when staff is aligned to organizational values whereas; a weak culture exists

when there is little alignment with organizational values. Strong cultures risk getting caught up

into group think, a condition where employees do not challenge organizational thinking and

innovative thought is diminished. Group think is a very common organizational occurrence

according to Wikipedia (2006).

Wikipedia (2006) identifies four classifications of organizational culture including: (a)

Power culture - which concentrates power among a few where there are few rules and little

bureaucracy; (b) role culture - where people have clear authorities within a hierarchical

bureaucracy; (c) task cultures - where teams are formed to solve particular problems and power

is based on expertise; and (d) person cultures - where all individuals view themselves as superior

to the organization. Wikipedia (2006) discusses seven  elements where culture is passed on

including: (a) Paradigm - which is organizational values or mission; (b) control systems - which

are processes to monitor what is going on such as rule books; (c) organizational structures -

which include reporting lines and hierarchies; (d) power structures - which include power spread and decision making; (e) symbols - including organizational logos, and symbols of power such as parking spaces and other perks; (f) rituals and routines - which include management meetings, board reports, and habitual organizational behavior; and (g) stories and myths - which convey events, messages, and values.  Wikipedia (2006) discussion of story telling is a similar tactic discussed by Sole and Wilson (2002).

In order to facilitate organizational change (Wikipedia, 2006) recommends six steps including: (a) clear strategic vision, (b) top management commitment, (c) modeling change from the highest level, (d) organizational modification to support organizational change, (e) socialization of newcomers and termination of deviants, and (f) development of ethical and legal sensitivity. These steps are similar tactics mentioned by Whitworth et. al. (2007), King et. al. (2004), Nelson and Economy (2005) and Sole and Wilson (2002).

Zablow (2006) mentions that businesses must have a risk management program that addresses ethics compliance, consensus, culture and business conduct.  Zablow (2006) mentions that there can be severe reputation and financial repercussions resulting from unethical behavior. On the positive side, ethical business practices (Zablow, 2006) are good for shareholders, regulators, law enforcement, lenders, insurance underwriters, analysts, bond raters and overall business. Zablow (2006) recommends: (a) top management ethical leadership, (b) establishment of a code of ethics, (c) zero tolerance for unethical conduct, (d) rewards and incentives for ethical behavior, (e) confidential reporting mechanisms, (f) an ethics program, and (g) establishment of an ethics board.  To get started, Zablow (2006) recommends conducting an ethics assessment including: (a) corporate culture, (b) compliance, (c) policies and procedures, (d) employee cultural perceptions, (e) ethics monitoring, (f) decision making models, (g) ethics support

resources, (h) management  and leadership practices, (i) rewards, (j) specific industry ethical issues and conduct, and (k) training and education.

Zablow (2006) recommends considering the following issues when implanting an ethics program including: (a) relevant laws, (b) employee ethics training, (c) decision models, (d) designated ethics officer, (e) identification of specific business ethical dilemmas, (f) role playing exercises, and (g) a mechanism for reporting.  Further, Zablow (2006) recommends surveying employees to identify specific industry ethical dilemmas and establishing focus groups and roundtables to deal with workplace dilemmas.

Zablow's (2006) discussion on corporate culture is similar to CliffsNotes (2008). Zablow's (2006) discussion on training is similar to King et. al. (2004). Zablow's (2006) discussion of an ethics program is similar to Whitworth et. al. (2007) and Harvey et. al. (2003).

Public Agency Literature Findings

To foster organizational values, norms, and culture, Fitzwater (2008) recommends a process for developing a city ethics policy.  Fitzwater (2008) mentions that employee ownership is essential.  Included in his recommended process are: (a) discuss the need for a city ethics policy at a council meeting, (b) establish a date four weeks in advance for a community meeting, (c) establish ground rules for the community meeting including topics and that group consensus should drive the discussion, (d) provide available examples of existing codes of ethics as examples, (e) assign group responsibilities and timetables, (f) assign a group facilitator to receive input from stakeholders, (g) place the code of ethics on the city web site for additional citizen input, (h) utilize citizen input to finalize the policy, and (i) have city council adopt the new code of ethics as an item in open session.

Hagstrom (2002), similar to Williams (2004) mentions ethical decisions are often a choice from options that render a "most right" decision. Hagstrom (2002) laments that the gray areas are most difficult because of competing values such as loyalty, generally a good value, which conflicts with honesty when faced with telling the truth about a fellow employee who has been unethical. Hagstrom (2002) cites organizational cultural issues such as attitudes, beliefs, norms, accepted practice, values, rules, standards, mission and goals as affecting decisions. Hagstrom (2002) states that some unethical employee decisions may come from an organizations' culture.

Hagstrom (2002) states that organizational structure, policies, codes of conduct, reward/punishment systems, orientation processes, decision-making processes, responsibility, and accountability assist with employee assimilation of values.  Hagstrom (2002) stresses the importance of ethical leadership to positively affect the organizational culture including: (a) strong commitment, (b) respect, (c) competence, (d) a value that the ends do not justify the means, (e) loneliness of courageous leadership, (f) dignity of all people, (g) sense of humor, (h) vulnerability and ability to admit mistakes, (i) ethical models fostered early in life, and (j) responsibility.

The International City/County Management Association [ICMA] (2004) adopted a code of ethics in 1924, amended it in 1998, and again in 2004.  IMCA (2004) considers numerous issues including: (a) Dedication to effective and democratic local government; (b) maintenance of a creative, constructive and practical attitude toward local government; (c) advice to officials of other local governments on public confidence, impression, appointments, credentials, professional respect, ethics violation reporting, confidentiality and employment seeking; (d) commitment to serve the best interests of the citizens including length of service, upholding local

policy, and avoiding conflicting roles; (e) recognition of local elected representatives for policy

development; (f) election advice against campaigning, running for political office, non

participation in political activities that support local candidates, and not endorse local candidates;

(g) continual improvement of professional ability including self-assessment, and continuing

education; (h) confidentiality of ethics violation cases; (i) practice of open communication with

the community with an emphasis on improving image; (j) making appointments, promotions, and

reorganizations based on merit; (k) practice of equal opportunity; (l) no direct or indirect

solicitation gifts, loans, travel, entertainment that could influence decisions or reward; (m)

avoidance of conflict of interest financial dealings; (n) disclosure  of personal relationships that

give the appearance of conflicts of interest; (o) avoidance of private employment that conflicts

with official duties; and (p) avoidance of endorsements of commercial products or services in

paid or other commercial advertisements.

The City of Vancouver Washington has general operating principles that were created to

foster ethical workplace behavior (Vancouver, 2002).  Vancouver's (2002) operating principles

encompass: (a) Stewardship including roads, parks, equipment, land etc.; (b) integrity including

thinking and acting right and truthful; (c) respecting people by treating all with dignity free from

violence, threats, harassment, discrimination, and bullying; (d) accountability by being

responsible to our commitment to community; (e) cooperation by a commitment to creativity,

and avoidance of we-they or win-lose solutions; (f) leadership  that is marked by directness,

openness to ideas, a willingness to be influenced, and commitment to success; (g) reputation and

a striving to be a safe, friendly, challenging, inspiring, productive, rewarding, value driven and

fun workplace. Vancouver (2002) has extensive ethics policies that, in detail, cover: (a) outside

employment, (b) conflicts of interests; (c) nepotism; (d) solicitation and distribution; (e) use of city property and systems; and (f) whistleblower protection.

Kane and Patapan (2006) point out that the New Public Management (NPM) initiative has overlooked risks associated with entrepreneurship with public resources. Kane and Patapan (2006) argue in favor of bringing the ethic of prudence back into public management. Kane and Patapan (2006) define prudence as the virtue of practical wisdom and superior character. They point out that many contemporary theorists believe the virtue of ethics has been systematically removed from public management. Further, Kane and Patapan (2006) point out that NPM's emphasis away from inputs and processes has blurred traditional lines of accountability. The entrepreneurial ethic, because of ethical violations associated with more freedom to take risk, has fostered the need for an ethics industry (Kane and Patapan (2006). Kane and Patapan (2006) believe that prudence was left out of NPM having been smothered by the new ethic of entrepreneurship.

Adams, Balfour, and Reed (2006), similar to Hagstrom (2002), and Williams (2004), in discussing the Abu Ghraib prison scandal, mention that the line of unethical and ethical behavior was blurred by various legal opinions, lack of clear written procedures, a need to adapt to a new paradigm of warfare, and the fact that the enemy had no established code to conduct warfare. Adams et. al. (2006) contend that group and social structures play a powerful part in human behavior. This finding is similar to King et. al.'s (2004) discussion of socialization tactics. Adams et. al. (2006) state that individual morality and ethics can be swallowed up by social roles and structure. Adams et. al. (2006), similar to Hagstrom (2002), and Williams (2004) state that few decisions are black and white decisions and that most are a series of smaller ambiguous

choices that lead to unethical behavior. Adams et. al. (2006) discussion of ambiguity is similar to Macarthur's post-modern discussion.

Macaulay and Lawton (2006), similar to Kane and Patapan (2006) point out that modern bureaucratization of government emphasizes the importance of management efficiency over virtue. Macaulay and Lawton (2006), in their research identify key knowledge's, skills, and abilities that allow monitoring officers in the United Kingdom to carry out their roll in monitoring local government, as directed by the Local Government Act of 2000.  Macaulay and Lawton (2006) mention that Alasdair MacIntyre promoted the concept that bureaucratic management relies on a system of efficiency and effectiveness, and leaves no room for moral debate. This is in contrast to Whitworth et .al. (2007) who feel that values are not about moral character or ethics.   Macaulay and Lawton (2006) disagree with the concept of the amoral manager. Macaulay and Lawton (2006) argue it is necessary to recognize that virtue is an essential characteristic of modern management. Macaulay and Lawton (2006) identified nine virtues including: (a) ethical awareness, (b) self-motivation, (c) personal resilience, (d) fearlessness, (e) interpersonal skills, (f) leadership, (g) leadership skills, (h) perseverance, (i) political sensitivity, and (j) verbal communication skills necessary for monitoring officer. Macaulay and Lawton (2006) further identified eight competencies necessary for a monitoring officer including: (a) investigative skills, (b) administrative skills, (c) legal expertise, (d) problem solving skills, (e) training abilities, (f) time management skills, (g) local authority experience, and (h) written communication skills.

One web site found by the researcher provided sample codes of ethics for city council members at www.cacities.org (2008).  The site contained sample codes from Calistoga, Campbell, Channel County Cities, Elks Grove, Folsom, Fresno, Goleta, Highland, Huntington

Beach, Pismo Beach, Santa Maria and others.   All of the sample codes contain similar elements including: (a) Compliance with the law; (b) professional and personal conduct; (c) compliance with Council adopted processes; (d) merit based decision making; (e) avoidance of conflicts of interest; (f) compliance with laws on gift acceptance; (g) respect for confidentiality of agency information; (h) use of public resources for private or personal gain; (i) advocacy; (j) support a positive work place environment; (k) general requirements including honesty, integrity, compliance with the spirit and letter of the law, providing model leadership, creating confidence in government, working towards the best interest of the agency; and (l) preparation for council agenda items (www.cacities.org, 2008). Similiarly, legal compliance was mentioned by Macaulay and Lawton (2006), Nelson and Economy (2005), and Zablow (2006).  Conflict of interest, (www.cacities.org, 2008), is also a common issue discussed by Whitworth et. al. (2007), and ICMA (2004).  Likewise, honesty, (www.cacities.org, 2008) is prevalent in the literature; also mentioned by Whitworth et. al. (2007), Harvey et. al. (2003), and Bobkiewicz, Hanley, Martello, Calonne, and Fleishman (2008).

The Department of Homeland Security [DHS] (2005) conducted a study of its Science and Technology Directorate, which focuses on addressing countermeasures for biological threats. A portion of the Directorate's funds go to national laboratories. DHS (2005) was directed to establish management controls to guard against conflicts of interest. Several deficiencies in ethical funding were found including: (a) lack of processes for determining the direction of research funding, (b) lack of documentation on how determinations for funding were made, (c) directorate officials were unclear about seeking waivers when appropriate to participate in certain funding determinations that presented conflicts of interest, and (d) directorate employees

did not receive regular training that addressed the ethical decisions unique to their mission (DHS, 2005). These were similar to Adams et. al's (2006) legal ambiguity.

Bobkiewicz et. al. (2008) discuss the issue of ethics in cyberspace. Bobkiewicz et. al. (2008) state that misinformation blogs on public policy issues are difficult to contradict. Bobkiewicz et. al. (2008) advocates contradicting inaccurate speech with accurate speech, since misinformation on blogs are nearly impossible to prosecute. Bobkiewicz et.al. (2008) feel misinformation on blogs is unethical if they are deliberately spreading inaccurate information. Bobkiewicz et. al. (2008) advocate the following blogging ethics on honesty and fairness: (a) Identify and provide links to sources; (b) do not misrepresent quotations, headlines, photos, or oversimplify incidents out of context; (c) never publish information that is known to be false; and (d) know the difference between advocacy, commentary, and factual information. Bobkiewicz et. al.'s (2008) discussion of misinformation is similar to honesty discussed by Whitworth et. al. (2007), Harvey et. al. (2003), and www.cities.org (2008).

Lobr, Devilly, Lilienfeld, and Olalunji (2006) offer an interesting value in the field of psychology. Lobr et. al. (2006) stresses the obligation to do no harm. As an example, they recommend informed consent on Critical Incident Stress Debriefing (CISD) because there is a lack of empirical evidence that it is beneficial and there is some evidence that it can actually be harmful (Lobr et. al. (2006).

Fire Service Literature Findings

The NFPA (2003) indicates that fire officers must exhibit ethical conduct. This includes honesty, ensuring safety, providing the best possible service, public decision making, and choosing actions that grant the maximum benefit to the citizens of the community.

Brunacini and Brunacini (2005) offer eighteen principles for fire departments to value including: (a) Showing up for work, getting the job done, and working hard; (b) taking care of Mrs. Smith; (c) valuing trust as everything; (d) ownership of one's own attitude and reaction; (e) talking less and listening more; (f) commitment to continual learning from everyone; (g) respecting the past but embracing change; (h) realizing that ego's will eat brains; (i) commitment to honesty and simplicity; (j) asking if you don't know; (k) learn to appreciate yes for an answer; (l) be diligent to not take things too seriously; (m) quit whining; (n) be tough, get it done and over with, and then unload the baggage; (o) accomplished is better than perfect; (p) play within your position assignment; and (q) avoid actions that feel good when you are angry.

White (2005) found the following seven necessary core values to be addressed in code of ethics: (a) honor, (b) courage, (c) fairness, (d) service, (e) pride, (f) teamwork, and (g) devotion to duty. The Sacramento Area Firefighters Local 522 (White, 2005) recommends fostering: (a) A positive workplace environment; (b) conduct; (c) use of organizational property; (d) gifts and gratuities; (e) disclosure of information; (f) privacy and confidentiality; (g) accuracy of books, records, and expense records; (h) proper exercise of authority, (i) reporting of ethics violations; and (j) enforcement. White (2005) recommended: (a) Legal review of the code of ethics; (b) feedback from employees; (c) union membership voter approval; (d) credible endorsements by the International Association of Firefighters ( IAFF) and California Professional Firefighters (CPF); (e) each member with a copy and signature page; (f) joint management-labor presentation of the code of ethics; (g) ethics training; (h) refresher training on code of ethics coupled with annual state mandated harassment training, (i) council updates, and (j) media coverage of the new code of ethics.

Whitley (2002) indicates that since the fire service does not control licensing, regulate membership, support ongoing field research in peer reviewed journals, and adhere to a uniform code of ethics, it is not a profession, but something less such as a trade, guild, or vocation. Whiteley (2002) recommends a national regulatory body, licensing, higher educational requirements, a uniform code of ethics, peer reviewed journals, and fire service specific field research as steps to move the fire service into a legitimately recognized profession.

Drumm (2000) found seven core values in his organization including: (a) Accountability; (b) responsiveness-customer service; (c) integrity - honesty; (d) trust; (e) fairness; (f) communication; and (g) leadership.  Drumm (2000) noted that while his organization had an ethics code, employees were not trained in understanding or using it.

Drumm's (2000) research recommends development of an ethics code that is simple and easy to understand. The code should incorporate seven guidelines including: (a) Obedience to the law, (b) truthfulness, (c) respect for people, (d) the Golden Rule, (e) practicing participation and not paternalism, (f) acting responsibly, and (g) do no harm.   In addition Drumm (2000) recommends setting realistic goals, establishment of a code of ethics for all members, and leadership by example.  Drumm (2000) feels a code of ethics should be subjected to periodic review, much like a strategic plan.  In addition he stresses legal review by a personnel attorney (Drumm, 2000).

Janing and Sachs (2003) point out that organizations which value internal and external customer perceptions regarding service quality do the following: (a) listen to their customers including thinking about their needs and talking to them, (b) practice continual customer perception assessment, (c) value goodwill towards customers as opposed to economics, (d) fix

poor customer service issues, (e) employ a whatever it takes practice of customer satisfaction, and (f) refine and redesign outdated processes that obstruct service quality.

Janing and Sachs (2003) also mention that fire departments need to model moments of truth when the public interacts with fire service personnel. Janing and Sachs (2003) point out that stories in the media can make or break the fire department's reputation and perception as a quality organization.

Janing and Sachs (2003) stress the importance of organizational vision, fostered by the leadership, to prevent archaic practices and provide forward direction. Janing and Sachs (2003) stress the importance of a vision statement that is developed with member input. Top management and support of vision is imperative (Janing and Sachs, 2003).

Janing and Sachs (2003) also stress the importance of an organizational mission statement to foster values and direction. In addition, Janing and Sachs (2003) recommend the creation of a values statement which identifies the basic beliefs and principles regarding how organization members will work together. They provide a model values statement (Janing and Sachs, 2003) that addresses: (a) do your best effort, (b) honesty, (c) integrity, (d) courage, (e) loyalty, (f) personal accountability, (g) trust of co-workers, (h) treating others as we wish to be treated, (i) leaving things better than we found them, (j) open communication and sharing of knowledge, (k) mutual encouragement and respect, (l) excellence in leadership from everyone, and (m) measurement of organizational success by customer satisfaction.

Wilson (2003), in his research on developing a fire department code of ethics, found a definite need for it. Wilson (2003), similar to Zablow (2006), McDonald (2006), and Fitzwater (2008) recommends the value of process in ethics code development.  Wilson (2003) recommends: (a) an interpersonal orientation, (b) gaining support from city council, (c)

formulation of a representative committee, (d) executive team review and revision, (e) fire department marketing plan for the code, (f) department wide training, (g) signed acknowledgements of the code of ethics, (h) a 90 day adjustment phase in, (i) fair and equitable enforcement, and (j) positive and negative discipline.

Wilson (2003) identified expected behaviors (positive) and unexpected behaviors (negative) that were included in their code of conduct.  Expected behaviors included: (a) honesty, (b) personal responsibility, (c) understanding, (d) teamwork, (e) respect, (f) communication, and (g) collaboration. Unexpected behaviors included: (a) unfounded information, (b) being part of the problem, (c) disrespect, (d) dishonesty, and (e) harassment.

Giomi (2002) found that his fire organization could not agree as to whether the department needed a code of ethics and training. Giomi (2002) noted that there was lack of trust between subordinates and supervisors. Nevertheless, in his research, Giomi (2002) recommended development of an ethics code. Giomi (2002), in agreement with White (2005) recommended ethics training for his organization. In addition, he recommended the use of a cross section of committee members to develop the code (Giomi, 2002).

In contrast, Tolbird (2002) found that his organization unanimously supported the development of an ethics code.  Tolbird (2002) also found support for a written code of ethics in the literature he reviewed.  In addition, Tolbird (2002) found that a code of ethics should have a positive affect on Total Quality Management concepts of customer satisfaction, fixing problems on the input side, good decision making, problem solving, and organizational performance. Like Giomi (2002), Tolbird (2002) recommended the development of a written code of ethics. Similar to Giomi (2002) and White (2005), Tolbird (2002) recommended extensive ethics

training.  Tolbird (2002) also recommended measurement of customer and employee satisfaction as it related to the new ethics code.

The International Association of Fire Chiefs has a Fire Chief's Code of ethics (IAFC, 2007). It covers the following issues: (a) Recognition that the fire chief position is held in public trust to utilize public resources effectively and judiciously; (b) do not utilize the position to obtain favors for personal business, relatives or friends; (c) do not take advantage of information gained as the fire chief; (d) conduct personal affairs to avoid improper influence on duties; (e) avoid financial conflicts of interest; (f) do not accept personal rewards for influence or action; (g) avoid professional activities that impair primary responsibilities; (h) comply with campaign rules and local laws; (i) deal with personnel matters based on merit; (j) do not endorse commercial products for personal gain; (k) develop job descriptions to mirror organizational ethics; (l) assure training and education on ethical codes and policy; (m) socialize new employees into the organizational ethics; (n) periodic ethics review and training; and (o) deliver timely and accurate information to the public and policy makers (IAFC, 2007).

The International Fire Service Training Association [IFSTA] (2004) offers a comprehensive review of ethics code development. IFSTA (2004) suggests core values including: (a) integrity, (b) excellence, (c) respect for the individual, (d) harmony, (e) loyalty, (f) faithfulness, (g) honesty, (h) fairness, (i) dedication, (j) responsibility, (k) accountability, (l) heroism, (m) patriotism, (n) perseverance, and (o) courage. IFSTA (2004) describes ethics as the examination of core principles of human conduct leading to right and wrong. IFSTA (2004) feels that ethics are the glue that holds a civilization or organization together. IFSTA (2004) recommends twelve steps in developing a code of ethics including: (a) Top management support; (b) middle management support; (c) involvement of all members in development; (d) define the

purpose of the code of ethics; (e) utilize a sample code as a starting point; (f) draft a proposed

model code; (g) implement the code on a pilot study basis; (h) review, revision, and final draft

development; (i) enforcement, monitoring and continual review processes built in; (j) training for

existing and new members; (k) legal review; and (l) state expected positive behavior.

Compton (2003) mentions five ethical responsibilities for fire service leaders including:

(a) Commitment to external customers; (b) treatment, support and commitment to internal

customers; (c) proper leadership and followership behaviors; (d) professionalism and honesty;

and (e) positive, healthy, and productive contribution to the organization. Compton (2003) adds

that loyalty to others, integrity, honesty and respect for the public trust is critical to successful

leadership.

One issue mentioned by Wilmoth (2003) are ethical issues associated with conferences

that are sponsored by vendors. Vendors are willing to pay close to $20,000 to obtain marketing

opportunities at such events to have an audience with chiefs. Taking advantage of perks

associated with such events creates an image of impropriety.

Coleman (2006) mentions that one fire department he worked for had rules and

regulations that were jokingly named after individuals who were disciplined and caused the rule

to be written. Coleman (2006) recommends that if you are in doubt, don't do it. Coleman

mentions four rationalizations that lead to unethical choices including: (a) An attitude that a

certain activity is reasonable, ethical, and not technically illegal; (b) an attitude that the activity

is in the organization's best interest and that the corporation has unwritten rules to engage in the

activity; (c) an attitude that the action is safe and will not be discovered or become public; and

(d) an attitude that if the activity helps the organization, then the organization will condone it or

cover for the employee who does it. Coleman (2006) recommends that fire departments adopt a

code of ethics, openly report financial conflicts of interest, and practice openness about their

involvement in community events.  Further, Coleman (2006) recommends consultation with the

organization's attorney for ethical advice.

Rielage (2008) defines ethics as the rules of conduct recognized by a profession, or as

individual principles of morality.  Rielage (2008) similar to Adams et. al. (2006), Hagstrom

(2002), and Williams (2004), indicates that ethics are not synonymous with religious beliefs

because that would relegate ethics to only religious people. Rielage (2008) feels that ethics are

not based on feelings because people can avoid ethical decisions if they choose to do what makes

them feel better versus what is right. Rielage (2008) also states that unethical decisions may be

legal. He cites slavery in America or ethnic cleansings in Darfur, which were legal, but highly

unethical. Rielage (2008) also indicates that societal acceptance can be slippery because the

masses are sometimes wrong and unethical. Rielage (2008) suggests if one doesn't want it aired

on 60 Minutes, then don't do it.

Stittleburg (2004) mentions that fire chiefs should avoid even the appearance of

impropriety. Similar to Coleman (2006) acting in good faith (Stittleburg, 2004) is not a good

defense. Stittleburg (2004) indicates that fire chiefs do not necessarily have to receive personal

benefit from a gift for it to constitute conflict of interest. Stittleburg (2004) adds that acceptable

practices in the private sector are not necessarily ethical in the public sector.

Evans (2007) laments that many fire departments hire for EMS knowledge, firefighting

skills, fitness, and other technical applications.  While important, Evans (2007) indicates that

character and ethics are a greater challenge because skills can be taught. In contrast, Evans

(2007) feels that character and ethics are a more difficult challenge to assess in a candidate.

Evans complains that most agencies expect good customer service from their firefighters but

they do not teach proper conduct, beliefs, and values that are expected. Evans (2007) feels that

ethical conduct means doing the right thing when nobody is watching. Ethics (Evans, 2007)

involves beliefs, values, standards, morality and honor. Evans (2007) inclusion of morality in his

discussion is in contrast to Rielage (2008), Adams et. al. (2006), Hagstrom (2002), and Williams

(2004). Evans (2007) discusses five commonly understood ethical models in an EMS setting

including rights, fairness, common good, virtue, and utilitarian.

Becker (2007) similar to MacArthur (2007), discusses what he calls moral ambiguity. He

(Becker, 2007) defines morals as the difference between good and bad. Becker (2007) claims

that ambiguity exists as a state of having more than one meaning or being open to interpretation.

According to Becker (2007), EMS organizations should strive to ensure that employee decisions

represent best industry practices and values committed to doing what is right. Becker (2007)

cites an example of employees who steal from their patients but justify their actions by

emphasizing that they provide the overall good service of EMS delivery.  Becker (2007) states

that most EMS agencies probably do not have a specific policy against stealing from patients and

he does not think the policy is necessary.  Brunacini (personal communication, January 14, 2006)

refers to such policy rules as don't eat broken glass type rules, indicating some things are so

obvious; we don't need rules to prohibit them.

Becker (2004) recommends that EMS organizations develop ethical standards and have

employees sign them.  Becker (2004) recommends several ethical standards for supervisors to

follow in order to model ethics to be emulated in an organization including: (a) Integrity and

moral fiber which includes treatment of employees, nurturing of employees, and listening to new

ideas; (b) loyalty which includes loyalty to the organization and backing employees when they

make mistakes; (c) respectfulness, which is respect for all employees; (d) consistency, which

means that employees follow their principles; and (e) commitment to the truth, which means an ability to stand up for what is right even at the expense of your position in the organization; passionate about commitment to the truth.

Bruegman (2006), similar to Brunacini (personal communication, January 14, 2006), Evans (2007), and Becker (2007), feel that ethical problems in government are the result of hiring unethical employees. Bruegman (2006) feels that no amount of statute or regulation can deal with the ethical challenges facing public employees that are not better handled by hiring honest people and creating an ethical work environment.

Bruegman (2006) mentions that nothing is more important to city administration than public opinion regarding citizen perceptions about honesty, truthfulness and personal integrity. Ethics violations have catapulted to the forefront precisely because of ethical misconduct by high-level professionals (Bruegman, 2006).  The recent Enron scandal, Adelphia Communications scandal, Martha Stewart, WorldCom, HealthSouth Corporation, and others have shaken international confidence in American corporations (Bruegman, 2006).

Bruegman (2006) advises to focus on seven critical elements including: (a) A reflection of local agency shared values in public service, leadership, and decision making; (b) the process is as important as the product and effort must address unique community values; (c) written in simple, direct language that is stated, as much as possible, in positive examples of expected behavior as well as prohibited behavior; (d) values based codes centered on do's rather than rules based codes centered on don'ts; (e) adoption of the code is only the beginning because effective change is a result of communication, training, and commitment; (f) periodic review in keeping the code current is necessary because it is a living document; and (g) self accountability is the

most constructive approach but when a heavier hand is necessary, enforcement should be in a fair and consistent manner.

Edwards (2005) defines ethics as character including moral excellence, self-discipline and good judgment. Edwards (2005) in contrast to Whitworth et .al. (2007), and Evans (2007) believes that ethical decisions almost always involve morality. Edwards (2005) cites a survey of corporate behavior that concluded that: (a) top management must clarify serious commitment to the ethics code enforcement, (b) the code must be supported by all members of the organization, and (c) the ethics code must be properly communicated to influence positive behavior. These are similar to IFSTA (2004) requirements of top management support, involvement of all members in code development, and training. Edwards (2005), similar to IFSTA (2004) offers a five step development process including: (a) Emphasis of top management support; (b) publishing the code for the whole organization; (c) developing compliance mechanism including training, communication, and auditing; (e) use of roundtable discussions to discuss continual employee ethics; and (f) measuring the results of compliance to the code.

Stein (2008), similar to Evans, (2007) laments that some fire service professionals are skeptical about teaching ethics.  Stein (2008) feels that the purpose of an organizational ethics program is to increase the likelihood of ethical behavior, not to make people ethical. Stein (2008) feels that the objective is to foster a positive department culture that makes it easier to do the right thing rather than the wrong thing. Stein (2008), similar to Evans (2007) recommends that a department that wishes to strengthen its ethical environment must hire and train character skills.

Campion (2007) points out that chief officers serve in a political environment that sometimes present challenges to ethical behavior because politics often are not in line with

ethical behavior.  Campion (2007) laments that the easy decision is rarely the ethical decision

and that the political decision often conflicts with the ethical choice.

Broman (2007) mentions that character is ethics in action and that, while we can't compel

employees to share our values, we must ensure that they know and support organizational values

when representing the fire department. Broman (2007) recommends publishing clear rules,

policies, and a code of conduct. Broman (2007), similar to Stein (2008) and Evans (2007), says

that agencies typically spend significant time training to improve member's abilities but invest

little time developing character. Broman (2007) recommends utilizing the Josephson Institute of

Ethics Six Pillars of Character mnemonic.  The six pillars are: (a) trustworthiness, (b) respect, (c)

responsibility, (c) fairness, (d) caring, and (f) citizenship. The mnemonic TRRFCC, pronounced

terrific, is helpful in remembering the six pillars (Broman, 2007).

Crosby (2007) believes that the concept of brotherhood in the fire service is distorted;

now meaning an excuse to avoid accountability, allow dishonor, and misbehavior. He cites as

troubling, recent headline grabbing firefighter behaviors including theft, violence, child

pornography and murder. Crosby (2007) feels that brotherhood is a tool to teach and foster ethics

in the fire service.  Crosby (2007), similar to Broman (2007), Stein (2008) and Evans (2007),

believes that ethics are teachable learned social behavior.  Crosby (2007) feels that fire service

leaders should address ethics as an essential component of a rightly defined brotherhood which

he defines as prevention of giving your respective crew or department a bad reputation.

Coleman (2006) discusses the values of tradition, loyalty, humanitarianism, bravery,

courage, dedication, rebirth after a disaster, and commitment to duty depicted in traditional fire

service symbols. For example, the Maltese cross stood for loyalty and humanitarianism Coleman

(2006) believes that the modern fire badge stands for all of these and that the symbolism of the

badge needs to be emphasized to new recruits because it captures hundreds of years of tradition.

For an international fire service perspective Yu-chun Ko (2008), similar to Crosby

(2007), Broman (2007), Stein (2008) and Evans (2007), found in a survey that many major

international fire departments ignore ethics training and place their emphasis on training

specialized workplace competencies. Yu-chun Ko (2008) did find in researching 10 major

departments in Asia, Europe, and North America that organizational values had three main

themes including: (a) professional conduct, (b) social relationship, and (c) personal conduct. Yu-

chun Ko (2008) revealed that most emphasis was placed on professional practice such as

professionalism, responsibility, and commitment. Ironically, (Yu-chun Ko, 2008) values related

to social relationship such as spirit de corps were seen as less significant. Yu-chun Ko (2008)

feels that traditional paramilitary discipline fails to meet the modern psychological needs of

modern firefighters.

Sargent (2006) states that top management must educate new personnel with a clear

understanding of organization values, expectations, goals, vision and objectives. Sargent (2006)

stresses that vision adherence by employees is related to their stake in the outcome. This, in turn,

is related to top management creating an environment that believes the vision is probable and

possible (Sargent, 2006). Sargent (2006) defines vision as a sense of direction, of knowing what

needs to be accomplished and doing it. Sargent (2006) states that employees don't follow

individuals, they follow ideas.

Sargent (2006) laments that many fire service leaders have difficulty getting away from

the concept of having a rule or policy for everything. He believes this is related to many fire

service leaders being deeply scarred by what he calls one-per centers who need a written policy

for everything (Sargent, 2006).  The reality is that many fire departments have goofy rules on the books (Sargent, 2006).  Sargent (2006), similar to Brunacini (personal communication, January 14, 2006), believes that the fire service is too complicated to have a rule for everything.  He concludes that we trust our employees with hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of apparatus and equipment, to make life and death decisions, and then get bogged down by archaic rules (Sargent, 2006). Sargent (2006) stresses fostering the values of judgment, intelligence, down-board thinking, loyalty, integrity and character instead of being so rule driven in the fire service. In addition, when situations arise, Sargent (2006) emphasizes keeping cool and not believing the first report.

## Literature Review Summary

Extensive and various methods were identified and in the business, public, and fire service literature reviewed. These various tools assist organizations in addressing and defining citizen expectations, organizational behavior, and, organizational values and norms. In addition, organizational culture and behavior can be fostered through the use of various methods. The literature findings assisted the researcher in identifying methods to further explore in this research project.

## Procedures

A descriptive method was used for this applied research project.  Procedures included a literature review, background information, 5 personal interviews, and 3 feedback instruments. One 17 question feedback instrument was sent to Rialto citizens (See Citizen Feedback Instrument: Appendix A). One 23 question feedback instrument question was sent to 236 fire agencies in the United States (See Fire Department Feedback Instrument: Appendix B). One 20 question feedback instrument was sent to RFD members (See RFD Feedback Instrument:

Appendix C).  The intent of the research was to identify customer and citizen expectations of

RFD organizational behavior. In addition, the purpose was to identify RFD employee

expectations of organizational behavior, discover methods utilized to adopt values and norms,

identify methods to influence employee behavior, and to identify any differences between non-

fire organizations regarding the previous mentioned items.

The literature review included 5 visits to the National Fire Academy (NFA) library

during the authors' attendance at the NFA in May 2007.  The review included published applied

research projects by former EFO students, books, and professional journals.  The researcher also

conducted reviews of internet websites of government, public safety, and private organizations.

Additional literature reviewed included searching the RFD library and journals, and the

researcher's personal library in June and July of 2008.

On August 5, 2008, the three feedback instruments were sent via email to 500 Rialto

citizens, 236 fire departments, and 82 RFD members.   The email lists for the Fire Department

Feedback Instrument are contained in appendices D and E respectively. The return rate on the

fire department feedback instrument was 55 or 23%, covering a population of approximately 17,

295,000 residents.  The researcher utilized a local citizen, Judy Roberts, who has 500 email

connections to Rialto citizens to obtain the citizen feedback. Included in her list are most service

clubs in Rialto.  The return rate on the Rialto citizen feedback instrument was 10%. The

researcher emailed all 82 RFD personnel to obtain feedback from RFD members.  The return rate

on the RFD Feedback Instrument was 50%.  The researcher received Local 3688 support and

recommendation for member participation.  Participation was voluntary and unfortunately, some

members chose not to participate.

Each citizen, fire agency or RFD employee respondent was asked to complete the feedback instrument at an attached web link from Survey Monkey included in a cover letter. The cover letter contained an explanation of the feedback instrument, information about the researcher, and instructions on accessing the instrument. The Citizen Feedback Instrument cover letter is in Appendix F, Fire Department cover letter in Appendix G, and RFD cover letter in Appendix H. The researcher subscribed to Survey Monkey which is a website that specializes in survey, questionnaire, and feedback instruments. The website surveymonkey.com was used as the sole provider for the feedback data collection and statistical analysis.

To improve reliability, hard copies of the feedback instruments were sent to 5 RFD command staff members, the fire marshal, and three RFD office staff members. The Local 3688 Executive Board members also reviewed the questions. Based on their input, all of the questions were simplified, edited or revised. The President of Local 3688 endorsed the project.

Personal interviews were conducted by email or in person with three academics with research experience in organizational behavior in July 2007. Two additional personal interviews were conducted because the researcher felt more information was needed to strengthen results. The academics were selected because of their expertise in Public Administration. They agreed to answer the interview questions and provided valuable data.

The researcher asked Battalion Chief Mike Peel, who has considerable experience developing interview questions, to review the questions. Based on his input, the introduction was clarified and 3 questions were simplified or revised. The interview questions are contained in Appendix I. The 5th edition of the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (2002) was utilized as the reference source for citations.

The following is a list of those interviewed: (a) Dr. Michael Macaulay, interviewed on August 4th, 2008 via email: Macaulay is the head of the Center for Public Services Management at the University of Teesside in the United Kingdom.  He specializes in political philosophy and has experience in national and international research projects on ethics and government. Macaulay conducted a year long research project on English local government for the Standards Board of England, reviewed the national Code of Conduct for the Standards Board for England. His most recent accomplishment is a soon to be published book entitled *Public Integrity*. Macaulay has published articles in journals such as Public Administration Review, Public Money and Management, and Local Government Studies.  His academic achievements include a MA (Honors) Politics from the University of Edinburgh, UK; MSC (Distinction) Management from the University of Teesside, UK; and a PhD in Utopian Political Theory from the University of Durham, UK; (b) Dr. Guy B. Adams, interviewed via email on August 4, 2008: Adams is a professor and associate director of the Harry S. Truman School of Public Affairs at the University of Missouri, Columbia.  He has experience researching public administration, history, theory, and ethics issues.  He is Editor in Chief of American Review of Public Administration. Adams possesses a PhD in Public Administration. He has co-authored research articles in journals such as Public Administration Review and co-authored the book *The Tacit Organization*; (c) Dr. George Reed, interviewed via email on July 31st, 2008: Reed is a professor and director of command and leadership studies at the U.S. Army War College in Carlisle Pennsylvania.  Reed is an army Colonel with 25 years experience as a military police officer and serves as a fellow at the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs at Syracuse University.  Reed also serves as a fellow at the Inter-University Seminar on Armed Forces and Society.  He has research experience in national security policy, strategic leadership and ethics.

Reed possesses a B.S. in Criminal Justice Administration from the University of Central

Missouri, a Master of Forensic Science from George Washington University, and a PhD in

Public Policy Analysis and Administration from Saint Louis University. He has extensive

experience consulting with organizations such as the U.S. Border Patrol, Anti-Defamation

League, Ohio State Highway Patrol, and the U.S. Military.  He has research experience in

organizational values, administrative evil and organizational ethics issues; (d) Judy Roberts,

interviewed via telephone on September 3, 2008: Judy Roberts is a well known and involved

citizen in Rialto.  She was instrumental in working with the city to get an 8% utility users tax

passed and she is the civilian in charge of coordinating Neighborhood Watch.  She is connected

to, and actively solicits, citizen input regarding public safety issues in Rialto; and (e) Eileen

Dienzo, interviewed via telephone on July 31, 2008: Dienzo has experience in Rialto gathering

data on employee exit interviews, compiling information on departments from a mystery shopper

program, and compiling customer satisfaction feedback information.  Dienzo has a BA in Public

Administration from California State University - San Bernardino and a Master of Science in

Organizational Management from the University of Phoenix.

Limitations

Scope: (a) The feedback, while not generalizable to the fire service because of the low

return rates, provides useful data for organizations, especially fire departments, hoping to address

organizational behavior issues in their respective agencies.

Assumption: It was assumed that the fire service feedback instrument respondents were

knowledgeable about their respective organizational values, norms and organizational culture.

Generalization: Since 50% of the RFD members chose not to participate in the RFD

Feedback Instrument, the results are not generalizable to RFD as a whole and only reflect the

respondent's answers.  This is also true for the Citizen Feedback Instrument which received 10% participation.

Expertise: The researcher is not an expert in designing feedback instruments but considerable time was invested in their development.

Organizational participation: The researcher sent the interview questions to Target Corporation and two utilities but did not receive anything back.  Assurances of participation were made but after three emails and phone calls, no results were produced. This represents a weakness of organizational participation outside of the fire service.

<div align="center">Results</div>

Research Question # 1: What are the customer's and citizens' expectations of organizational behavior?

This question was answered by a Citizen Feedback Instrument (See Appendix A).  and by five interviews conducted via email or by phone.  The interview questions are included in Appendix I.   The citizen feedback instrument was sent to 500 citizens.  There was a 10% return rate.  For more details, see the Procedures section. Raw data for the Citizen Feedback Instrument is in Appendix J.

On July 31, 2008 the researcher received in put back from Dr. George Reed.  Dr. Reeds' biographical sketch is included in the Procedures section. Reed (personal communication, July 31, 2008) indicated that, from his research findings, the public expects fire departments to provide competent work, exhibit professionalism, and demonstrate responsiveness to problem resolution. In addition, fire departments need to be transparent and provide unselfish service to society (G. Reed, personal communication, July 31, 2008).

On August 4, 2008, the researcher received input from Dr. Guy Adams.  Dr. Adams' biographical sketch is included in the Procedures section.  Adams (personal communication, August 4, 2008) stated that, based on his research experience, customers expect their fire departments to provide high level performance and high level integrity.

On August 4, 2008 the researcher received input from Dr. Michael Macaulay.  Dr. Macaulay's' biographical sketch is included in the Procedures section.  Macaulay (personal communication, August 4, 2008) feels that first and foremost, customers expect their fire departments to provide the best job as quickly and as efficiently as possible.  Macaulay stated there is a great deal of distrust between the public and public servants in the UK with the exception of public safety organizations.  Macaulay (personal communication, August 4, 2008) stated from his research opinion that customers don't really care about internal organizational behavior as long as external organizational behavior continues to deliver expected services.

On September 3, 2008, the researcher interviewed Judy Roberts.  Robert's biographical sketch is included in the Procedures section.  Roberts (personal communication, September 3, 2008) stated that she hears many positive comments about RFD and the only complaint she hears occasionally is that they were slow in responding.

On September 4, 2008, the researcher interviewed Eileen Dienzo, Human Resources Specialist for Rialto.  Dienzo's biographical sketch is included in the Procedures section.  Dienzo (personal communication, September 4, 2008) stated that RFD received very good marks on helpfulness and phone etiquette from the mystery shopper program. Dienzo stated citizens want help and get it at RFD.   RFD's physical layout at headquarters is not viewed favorably. Dienzo also stated her employee application customer feedback information reveals that RFD is viewed as very open and customer friendly towards citizens seeking employment in the fire service.

On August 7, 2008, the researcher sent 500 Citizen Feedback Instruments to Rialto Citizens. For more details, see the Procedures section.

The Rialto Citizens Feedback instrument question # 1.  I have lived in Rialto for:

Choices were:

1 to 5 Years    (14% or 7)       6 to 10 Years   (12% or 6)      11 to 15 Years (16% or 8)

16 to 20 Years (16%)

Over 20 Years (42%)

Answered question (50)

Skipped question     (0)

Rialto Citizen Feedback instrument question # 2: I have served in the following service clubs.  (Choices were)

Rotary (8.3%)          Exchange Club of Rialto (16.7%)      Kiwanis (11.1%)

Lyons (2.8%)           Other   (61.1%)

Answered question (36)

Skipped question    (14)

Rialto Citizen Feedback instrument question # 3: What are the expectations of organizational behavior for Rialto Fire Department? (This question received 19 comments)

   a)  "To provide loyalty, honesty and fairness."

   b)  "Fairness."

   c)  "To serve the community of Rialto in a timely manner."

   d)  "Support community events such as 'Run Whatcha Brung', Relay, fire prevention, quick response."

e) "Professional department; involvement in community; prepared for disasters; well

   trained; quick response."

f) "To respond in those in need no matter color, age, sex."

g) "To serve and protect our community by professional service practices, knowledge of job

   expectations, obedience to superiors & a desire to advance."

h) "Quick timely response and well trained."

i) "To serve with integrity, patience, and a love for the community."

j) "To show up quickly, behave professionally."

k) "I think they are doing a great job."

l) "To help the community when in need."

m) "Organized and well educated with employees who put the lives of others before their

   own."

n) "Strong Leadership with a desire to promote growth within the Dept. A vision to serving

   the Future of Rialto and not looking backwards. Staying on the cutting edge of training

   and tactics to always improve competency and response times."

o) "To conscientiously perform their duties."

p) "professional."

q) "I expect problems within the department to be handled efficiently, effectively and fairly

   to all regardless of race, color or creed."

Rialto Citizen Feedback Instrument question # 4: Rialto Fire Department has clearly defined

organizational values and norms.  (Choices were)

Strongly Agree                                    (26%)

Agree                                             (38%)

| | |
|---|---|
| Disagree | (2%) |
| Strongly Disagree | (0%) |
| Don't Know | (34%) |
| Answered question | (50) |
| Skipped question | (0) |

Rialto Citizen Feedback Instrument question # 5: Organizational values and norms at Rialto Fire

Department are communicated by: (check all that are applicable)

| | |
|---|---|
| Vision Statement | (34.7% or 17) |
| Mission Statement | (40.8% or 20) |
| Community Training | (44.9% or 22) |
| Tradition | (32.7% or 16) |
| Department Motto | (20.4% or 10) |
| Symbols | (28.6% or 14) |
| Don't Know | (30.6% or 15) |
| Answered question | (49) |
| Skipped question | (1) |

Rialto Citizen Feedback Instrument question # 6: Out of the following two qualities, select the

one that you value the most for Rialto Firefighters. (Choices were)

| | |
|---|---|
| Fearlessness | (20.4% or 10) |
| Honor | (79.6% or 39) |
| Answered question | (49) |
| Skipped question | (1) |

Rialto Citizen Feedback Instrument question # 7: Out of the following two qualities, select one that you value most for the Rialto Fire Department. (Choices were)

Courage                                          (84% or 42)

Heroism                                          (16% or 8)

Answered question                               (50)

Skipped question                                (0)

Rialto Citizen Feedback Instrument question # 8: Out of the following two qualities, select one that you value the most for Rialto Fire Department. (Choices were)

Devotion to Duty                                (75.5% or 37)

Loyalty                                          (24.5% or 12)

Answered question                               (49)

Skipped question                                (1)

Rialto Citizen Feedback Instrument question # 9: Out of the following two qualities, select one that you value the most for Rialto Fire Department. (Choices were)

Accountability                                  (46% or 23)

Trustworthiness                                 (54% or 27)

Answered question                               (50)

Skipped question                                (0)

Rialto Citizen Feedback Instrument question # 10:  Out of the following two qualities, select one that you value the most for Rialto Fire Department.  (Choices were)

Prudence                                         (8% or 4)

Ethical Behavior                                (92% or 46)

Answered question                               (50)

Skipped question                                                    (0)

Rialto Citizen Feedback Instrument question # 11:  Out of the following two qualities, select one

that you value the most for Rialto Fire Department. (Choices were)

Rewards                                                              (12 % or 6)

Top Management Support                                               (88% or 44)

Answered question                                                   (50)

Skipped question                                                    (0)

Rialto Citizen Feedback Instrument question # 12:  Out of the following two qualities, select one

that you value most for Rialto Fire Department.  (Choices were)

Fairness                                                             (62% or 31)

Equitable Enforcement:                                              (38% or 19)

Answered question                                                   50

Skipped question                                                    (0)

Rialto Citizen Feedback Instrument question # 13: As a customer of Rialto Fire Department,

which of the following do you value the most?  (Choices were)

Quick Response                                                      (75.5% or 37)

Helpfulness                                                         (24.5% or 12)

Rialto Citizen Feedback Instrument question # 14: As a customer of Rialto Fire Department,

which of the following do you value the most?  (Choices were)

Reliability                                                         (44% or 22)

Competence                                                          (56% or 28)

 Answered question                                                  (50)

Skipped question                                                    (0)

Rialto Citizen Feedback Instrument question # 15: As a customer of Rialto Fire Department,

which of the following do you value the most?  (Choices were)

Ability to solve problems                              (80% or 40)

Tangibles (facilities/Equipment)                       (20% or 10)

Answered question                                      (50)

Skipped question                                       (0)

Rialto Citizen Feedback Instrument question # 16:  As a customer of Rialto Fire Department,

which of the following do you value the most?  (Choices were)

Empathy                                                (32% or 16)

Honesty                                                (68% or 34)

Answered question                                      (50)

Skipped question                                       (1)

Rialto Citizen Feedback Instrument question # 17:  As a customer of Rialto Fire Department,

which of the following do you value the most?  (Choices were)

My interests placed above Rialto's interests           (26.5% or 13)

Trustworthiness                                        (73.5% or 36)

Answered question                                      (49)

Skipped question                                       (1)

Comments:

a)  "The fire department is always helpful, I wish more joined up."

b)  "Rialto fire department is a professional organization."

c)  "I have always had very good dealings with our fire dept. They have always responded in

a fast time and have always been patient and kind and very good at what they do."

d)  "I like the paramedics."

e)  "It is ideal for the fire personnel to be a residence of Rialto for I believe this brings a personal bond to the community.  However on a very personal note, if you feel that it was necessary to conduct a survey with these types of controversial questions, it seems that upper management may need to be revisited and some restructuring is needed within the Rialto Fire Department organization."

f)  "Integrity, fidelity, confidentiality, empathy, competence."

g)  "All of above".

h)  "I can say I have never had or know any person that has had any bad service. And no complaints. That say's a lot about them."

i)  "I would like to see a Chief that has a good working relationship with the guys that go out everyday and do the hard job of taking care of the public. It seems like we haven't had that in the last 2 Fire Chief's."

j)  "I think more money should be allotted to the city departments, (fire/police/emt, etc.) to have sufficient staff to see the needs and well being of the city's residents.  This would include the finest training and equipment for our fearless and dedicated men/women. Thank you."

k)  "Humility."

l)  "I think they do an excellent job."

m) "I believe the questions asked about the Fire Dept's behavior and integrity are very important in addition to the employee being properly trained, being honest, reliable, etc. are important when being called to a 911 call."

n)  "To be treated as if I and my family are important by trained professionals."

o) "Cheerful, competent, knowledgeable, willingness to help."

p) "They are more competent than the hospital staff at times."

q) "To have the Fire Department respond promptly and be treated with respect."

r) "Desire for knowledge."

s) "They function as a unit, act with integrity, and show compassion."

t) "Professional attitude towards job with respect to locals."

u) "Leading by example. Professionalism."

v) "Outstanding efficiency".

w) "Arrive quickly when I call for them."

x) I expect any member of the Fire Dept to behave in a professional manner and that they

are trained to perform their duties in a responsible and effective manner."

y) "Employees should be well trained to deal with the public, show compassion."

z) "Trust and working well together."

aa) "Integrity, commitment and professionalism."

bb) "Professional and focused."

cc) "Good personal behavior."

dd) "My expectations are that Fire Department be Professional, courteous, and sensitivity

towards the publics needs, issues and/or situations."

ee) "Fast response, competent personnel, honesty."

ff) "To serve the community."

gg) "I expect to be treated with dignity and respect, quick and competent response."

Research Question # 2: What are the employees' expectations of organizational behavior?

This question was answered by a 20 RFD Feedback Instrument (Appendix C) and by 4 personal interviews conducted via email and via telephone.  The interview questions are included in Appendix I. Eighty-two RFD feedback instruments were sent via email to all personnel. Forty-one were returned completed for a 50% return rate.  (For more details, see the Procedures section.)  Raw data is included in Appendix L.

On July 31, 2008 the researcher received in put back from Dr. George Reed.  Reeds' biographical sketch is included in the Procedures section. Reed (personal communication, July 31, 2008) indicated that, from his research findings, firefighters expect fairness, equity, opportunities for advancement and development, just compensation and top management support. Reed (personal communication, July 31, 2008) also indicated that firefighters expect transparency, unselfish service, professionalism, and responsiveness to their concerns from top management.

On August 4, 2008, the researcher received input from Dr. Guy Adams.  Adams' biographical sketch is included in the Procedures section.  Adams (personal communication, August 4, 2008) stated that, based on his research experience, firefighters expectations vary by organization.

On August 4, 2008 the researcher received input from Dr. Michael Macaulay. Macaulay's' biographical sketch is included in the Procedures section.  Macaulay (personal communication, August 4, 2008) feels that firefighters expect to be treated with respect, be listened to,  want non-arbitrary and fair decisions, and do not like rapid or cyclical, counter-productive change.

On September 4, 2008 the researcher interviewed Eileen Dienzo. Her biographical sketch is contained in the procedures section.  See Appendix (J) for the interview questions.  Dienzo's'

(personal communication, September 4, 2008) exit interview data reveals that employees leave

RFD for better pay, benefits, larger departments, and more prosperous fire agency service

populations; expectations that the city is not in a position to change much .

RFD Feedback Instrument question # 1:  My rank at Rialto Fire Department is: (Choices

were)

Firefighter      (43.9% or 18)          Engineer              (9.8% or 4)

Captain          (24.4% or 10)          Command Staff        (12.2% or 5)

Civilian (Non-Safety)                    (9.8% or 4)

Skipped question                         (0%)

RFD Feedback Instrument question # 2: Scenario: You are a fire captain in charge of

developing specifications for new Wildland PPE.  You research options and make purchase

recommendations to the Fire Chief.  Your department is currently out to bid on the purchase of

new single layer Wildland PPE.  One of the competitors that bid on the contract comes up to you

at a trade show and offers you some free tickets to an upcoming professional sports playoff

game.  You should: (Choices were)

Accept the tickets because this is acceptable at RFD.              (6.5% or 2)

Decline the offer and report the incident to your Battalion Chief     (93.5% or 29)

Allow your firefighter to accept the tickets                          (0%)

Other action                                                          (14 comments)

Answered question                                                     (31)

Skipped question                                                      (10)

Comments:

"Decline the offer, thank the vendor, advise the vendor of department policy and mention the incident to the Battalion Chief."

"Make sure the competitor understands that I have no influence on the outcome of the bid and that if he still would like to give me the tickets, then I will accept them."

"Explain to the bidder that I have no control over which contract we accept, and if he still wants to give me the tickets, I'd take them."

"Decline tickets politely."

"Decline the offer. Although it is probably done by bid competitors, it is unethical to accept them".

"I would respectfully decline the offer and not report it to the B. C."

"Thank the individual for the gesture and decline the tickets."

"Advised the person that the department does not let us accept these type of gifts."

"Accept tickets and sell them as a fundraiser to purchase items for fire department special events."

"But it really depends on who is playing…joking."

"Decline the offer."

"Refuse the tickets and tell the competitor I am not able to take the tickets, but thanks anyway."

"At times I have had tickets given to me by people who went to these shows. Some people on this department even past officers and current people on this department accept perks."

"Decline the offer and continue with the bid process. Many sellers offer 'freebies' so as a professional, you are inclined to say no. That does not mean business must stop."

RFD Feedback Instrument question # 3. Scenario:  You are a firefighter-paramedic at an outlying fire station.  You respond to a structure fire at a liquor store located in a mutual aid area

west of your jurisdiction.  The fire has been extinguished and the store owner tells your Captain

to take two cases of whiskey because it's going to be condemned by the Health Department.

Your Captain accepts the offer and loads the cases into the fire engine.  He instructs the engine

crew that "Nobody needs to know about this."  You should: (Choices were)

Tell the Captain you don't want any part of this and let him know you'll report the incident if he

doesn't put the whiskey back.                                    (84.6 % or 33)

Keep quiet about the incident. It's his decision and his problem.     (5.1% or 2)

Keep quiet, but report the incident to the Battalion Chief when

you return to quarters.                                         (10.3% or 4)

Ask the Captain if you can have some to take home.          (0%)

Other (Please specify)                                      (4 comments)

Answered question                                          (39)

Skipped question                                            2

Comments:

"This is so over the top it simply would not happen."

"I would talk to the captain and let him know that I am not comfortable with the decision to take

the whiskey.  I would let the captain know that I am part of this situation because I know about

the deal made with the store owner.  I would try to have the captain make the right decision.  If

the captain still takes the whiskey, I would be forced to report it to my BC."

"When back in quarters, I would report this to the Battalion Chief. I also would contact the

Union."

"I would inquire about the captains' means.  Telling an officer and ultimatum is not a good

thing!  Asking what is the purpose of the owner's property recovery?  If captain remains against

department rules, notify my HR director (because notifying a B/C will result in myself being written up."

RFD Feedback Instrument question # 4.  Scenario:  Your Battalion Chief forgot to attend a grand opening of a new Fitness 19 facility.  You are a Captain and receive a phone call from a City Council member who wants to know where the Battalion Chief was during the event.  You place the call on hold and ask the Battalion Chief what to do.  The Battalion Chief says to tell the Council Member that he was tied up on an emergency.  You know this is not true and that the Battalion Chief simply forgot to attend the grand opening.  You should:  (Choices were)

Tell the Council Member the truth.                                         (2.7% or 1)

Cover for the Battalion Chief because there was a major fire in a

neighboring community that he "could" have been involved in.      (0%)

Hand the phone to the Battalion Chief.                              (97.3% or 36)

Other action                                                        (6 comments)

Answered question                                                   (37)

Skipped question                                                    (4)

Comments:

"Advise the Battalion Chief, I will not lie to the Council member and he needs to discuss the matter with the Council member."

"I would tell the BC I do not feel comfortable with this and would ask if the BC could talk with the city council member."

"Let the Battalion Chief speak with the City Council member."

"Follow my battalion chief's orders."

"Do not know what the Battalion Chief plan for the day is."

"Take the B/C's word and state what you were told.  I don't always know what the B/C's

emergency calls are might be a personnel issue and a 'fire'."

RFD Feedback Instrument question # 5: Organizational values and norms are passed on

at Rialto Fire Department by: (Check all that are applicable)

| | |
|---|---|
| Legal mandate | (36.6% or 15) |
| Story Telling | (51.2% or 21) |
| Rules and Regulations | (73.2% or 30) |
| Policies | (80.5% or 33) |
| Training | (70.7% or 29) |
| Vision Statement | (36.6% or 15) |
| Mission Statement | (48.8% or 20) |

RFD Feedback Instrument question # 6.  Rialto Fire Department has clearly defined

organizational values and norms. (Choices were)

| | |
|---|---|
| Strongly Agree | (7.5% or 3) |
| Agree | (60% or 24) |
| Disagree | (20% or 8) |
| Strongly Disagree | (10% or 4) |
| Don't Know | (2.5% or 1) |
| Answered question | (40) |
| Skipped question | (1) |

RFD Feedback Instrument question # 7.  Organizational values and norms are passed on

at Rialto Fire Department by: (Check all that are applicable)

| | |
|---|---|
| Tradition | (92.3% or 36) |

| | |
|---|---|
| Department Motto | (38.5% or 15) |
| Department Values Statement | (28.2% or 11) |
| Ethics Policy | (35.9% or 14) |
| Specialized Certification | (10.3% or 4) |
| Mentoring | (76.9 % or 30) |
| Probationary Process | (66.7% or 26) |
| Answered question | (39) |
| Skipped question | (2) |

RFD Feedback Instrument question # 8: Organizational values and norms are passed on at Rialto Fire Department by: (Check all that are applicable)

| | |
|---|---|
| Role Playing | (17.9% or 7) |
| Rewards for expected behavior | (15.4% or 6) |
| Ethics Monitoring | (15.4% or 6) |
| Specific industry dilemmas identified | (23.1% or 9) |
| Ethical Example | (41% or 16) |
| Symbols | (7.7% or 3) |
| Organizational Culture | (76.9% or 30) |
| Answered question | (39) |
| Skipped question | (2) |

RFD Feedback Instrument question # 9: Out of the following two qualities, select one that you value the most at Rialto Fire Department.  (Choices were)

| | |
|---|---|
| Fearlessness | (10.3% or 4) |
| Honor | (89.7% or 35) |

Answered question                                                        (39)

Skipped question                                                         (2)

RFD Feedback Instrument question # 10: Out of the following two qualities, select one

that you value the most at Rialto Fire Department.  (Choices were)

Courage                                                                  (97.4% or 38)

Heroism                                                                  (2.6 % or 1)

Answered question                                                        (38)

Skipped question                                                         (3)

RFD Feedback Instrument question # 11: Out of the following two qualities, select one

that you value the most at Rialto Fire Department.  (Choices were)

Devotion to Duty                                                         (68.8% or 25)

Loyalty                                                                  (34.2% or 13)

Answered question                                                        (38)

Skipped question                                                         (3)

RFD Feedback Instrument question # 12: Out of the following two qualities, select one

that you value the most at Rialto Fire Department.  (Choices were)

Accountability                                                          (33.3% or 13)

Trustworthiness                                                         (66.7% or 26)

Answered question                                                        (39)

Skipped question                                                         (2)

RFD Feedback Instrument question # 13: Out of the following two qualities, select one

that you value the most at Rialto Fire Department.  (Choices were)

Prudence                                                                (15.8% or 6)

Ethical Behavior                                                    (84.2% or 32)

Answered question                                                  (38)

Skipped question                                                   (3)

RFD Feedback Instrument question # 14: Out of the following two qualities, select one

that you value the most at Rialto Fire Department.  (Choices were)

Rewards                                                            (18.9% or 7)

Top Management Support                                             (81.1% or 30)

Answered question                                                  (37)

Skipped question                                                   (4)

RFD Feedback Instrument question # 15: Out of the following two qualities, select one

that you value the most at Rialto Fire Department.  (Choices were)

Fairness                                                           (76.9% or 30)

Equitable Enforcement                                             (23.1% or 9)

Answered question                                                  (39)

Skipped question                                                   (2)

RFD Feedback Instrument question # 16: From your experience, which of the following

do you feel Rialto Fire Department customers value the most? (Choices were)

Quick Response                                                     (17.5% or 7)

Helpfulness                                                        (82.5% or 33)

Answered question                                                  (40)

Skipped question                                                   (1)

RFD Feedback Instrument question # 17: From your experience, which of the following

do you feel Rialto Fire Department customers value the most? (Choices were)

Ability to solve problems                                    (97.5% or 39)

Tangibles (such as facilities and equipment)                 (2.5% or 1)

Answered question                                            (40)

Skipped question                                             (1)

RFD Feedback Instrument question # 18: From your experience, which of the following

do you feel Rialto Fire Department customers value the most? (Choices were)

Reliability                                                  (37.5% or 15)

Competence                                                   (62.5% or 25)

Answered question                                            (40)

Skipped question                                             (1)

RFD Feedback Instrument question # 19: From your experience, which of the following

do you feel Rialto Fire Department customers value the most? (Choices were)

Empathy                                                      (70% or 28)

Honesty                                                      (30% or12)

Answered question                                            (40)

Skipped question                                             (1)

RFD Feedback Instrument question # 20: From your experience, which of the following

do you feel Rialto Fire Department customers value the most? (Choices were)

Customer interests placed above the organizations'.          (48.6% or 18)

Trustworthiness                                              (51.4% or 19)

Other (Please specify)                                       (7 comments)

Answered question                                            (37)

Skipped question                                             (4)

Comments:

"Almost every question of the select from two, neither was applicable."

"This survey which is probably very useful for this project, but does not include any internal

customer service questions regarding the treatment of our own, which for this department is very

poor except for a select few!!!"

"For the most part Rialto customers have small problems.  They want to be treated with respect

and they want help with that problem."

"I think the customers value trustworthiness more because trust that we are going to perform up

to their expectation."

"From answer 7 to 20 you need to add a comment box.  The answers didn't fit the questions. 7

could have a number of answers depends on Captain Station and Shift. 8 this also can have a

number of answers I could go on and on over the rest of the questions but I think you get the

pitcher."

"Knowing that the best service will be provided to them in a time of need. Even if that service

may not be the customers 'wants' or needs."

"Questions nine through fifteen were not answered, because none of the answer options given in

each question were applicable."

Research Question # 3: How are organizational values and norms adopted?

Four personal interviews were conducted via email and telephone.  The interview

questions are included in Appendix I.  For more details, see the Procedures section.

On July 31, 2008 the researcher interviewed Dr. George Reed.  Reed's biographical

sketch is in the Procedures section.  Reed (personal communication, July 31, 2008) mentioned

Edgar Schein's notion that points to patterns of behavior that are learned by people in the

organization as the method that he believes works.  Reed (personal communication, July 31,
2008) feels that employees observe behavior and learn successful ways of dealing with
organizational life.

On August 4, 2008, the researcher interviewed Dr. Guy Adams.  Adams biographical
sketch is included in the Procedures section of this research paper.  Adams (personal
communication August 4, 2008) feels that organizations communicate values and norms through
their socialization tactics that exist as part of the organizational culture.

On August 4, 2008 the researcher interviewed Dr. Michael Macaulay.   Macaulay's
biographical sketch is included in the Procedures section.  Macaulay (personal communication,
August 4, 2008) feels that values and norms emerge through years of homogenous organizational
culture.  Macaulay stated he would like to say that values and norms are adopted through
leadership. However, he felt that it is more realistic to view adoption of values and norms as part
of group behavior expectations (M. Macaulay, personal communication, August 4, 2008).
Macaulay stated when change occurs, employees require a strong leader at the helm.  Macaulay
cited a situation in the UK where a new Chief was appointed in Darlington.  The new chief was
the first female in the history of the fire service and came from outside the fire service. Because
she had such different views on how to run the fire service, she encountered a lot of resistance.
She was surprised at how entrenched the male-oriented military type culture was.  She has
challenged the system but not without opposition (M. Macaulay, personal communication,
August 4, 2008).

On September 4, 2004, the researcher interviewed Eileen Dienzo.  Dienzo's biographical
sketch is in the Procedures section.  Dienzo (personal communication, September 4, 2008) stated
that Rialto's process should be top down development with employee input, processes, meetings,

trust building, and good communication.  Dienzo lamented that Rialto supervisors are not always

accurate with their information resulting in mass thinking, rumors and negative peer influence.

In addition, she stated that the city of Rialto currently has a politicized environment that is not

ideal for values and norms development.  Dienzo (personal communication September 4, 2008)

also mentioned the value of training and mentoring.

Research Question # 4: How do organizations influence employee behavior?

This question was answered by a 23 question Fire Department Feedback Instrument

(Appendix B) instrument and 4 personal interviews with research experts conducted via email

and by phone.  The interview questions are in appendix I. Two hundred and thirty-six feedback

instruments were sent out and 55 were completed for a 28% return rate, serving a population of

17, 295,000 residents.  Fifty-five email addresses were not undeliverable.  For more details, see

the Procedures section. Raw data us in Appendix K.

On August 4, 2008, the researcher interviewed Dr. Guy Adams. Adams biographical

sketch is included in the Procedures section of this research paper.  Adams (personal

communication August 4, 2008 feels that organizations communicate values and norms through

their socialization tactics that exist as part of the organizational culture.

On July 31, 2008, the researcher interviewed Dr. George Reed.  Reed's biographical

sketch is included in the Procedures section.  Reed (personal communication, July 31, 2008)

feels that his research includes organizational culture, rules, procedures, laws, financial

inducements, perquisites, ethical codes and socialization through observed behavior are

important components that organizations utilize to influence employee behavior.

On August 4, 2008 the researcher interviewed Dr. Guy Adams.  Adams biographical

sketch is included in the Procedures section of this research paper.   Adams (personal

communication, August 4, 2008) feels that the most effective method to influence employee

behavior is socialization through the organizational culture.  Adams (personal communication

August 4, 2008) also mentioned that he generally believes in the findings of multiple methods

generally described by Hertzberg in his research.

On August 4, 2008 the researcher interviewed Dr. Michael Macaulay.  Macaulay's

biographical sketch is included in the Procedures section of this research paper.  Macaulay

(personal communication August 4, 2008) feels that employee behavior is a product of years of

homogenous organizational culture. Macaulay (personal communication August 4, 2008) feels

that leadership has some influence on employee behavior, but not as much influence.

On September 4, 2008, the researcher interviewed Eileen Dienzo (personal

communication, September 4, 2008).  Her biographical sketch is included in the procedures

section.  Dienzo feels that organizations should utilize policies, procedures, training, mentoring,

and is a big proponent of succession planning.

Fire Agency Feedback Instrument question # 1:  My fire department serves a jurisdiction

of:  Choices were

| | |
|---|---|
| 10,000 or less residents | (3.7% or 2) |
| 10,001 to 25,000 residents | (13% or 7) |
| 25,001 to 50,000 residents | (24.1% or 13) |
| 50,001 to 100,000 residents | (22.2% or 12) |
| 100,001 to 500,000 residents | (25.9% or 14) |
| 500,001 or more residents | (11.1% or 6) |
| Answered question | (54) |
| Skipped question | (1) |

Fire Agency Feedback Instrument question # 2: My fire department is: (Choices were)

| | |
|---|---|
| All Volunteer | (0%) |
| Paid Call | (0%) |
| Combination: Volunteer and Fully Compensated | (25.5% or 14) |
| Fully Compensated | (74.5% or 41) |
| Answered question | (55) |
| Skipped question | (0) |

Fire Agency Feedback Instrument question # 3: My length of time in the fire service is:

(Choices were)

| | |
|---|---|
| 1 to 5 years | (0%) |
| 6 to 10 years | (0%) |
| 11 to 15 years | (14.8% or 8) |
| 16 to 20 years | (25.9% or 14) |
| 21 to 25 years | (16.7% or 9) |
| Over 25 years | (42.6% or 23) |
| Answered question | (54) |
| Skipped question | (1) |

Fire Agency Feedback Instrument question # 4: My rank in the fire service is: (Choices were)

| | |
|---|---|
| Firefighter | (0%) |
| Engineer | (0%) |
| Captain | (9.1% or 5) |
| Battalion Chief | (34.5% or 19) |
| Division Chief | (7.3% or 4) |

Assistant Chief                                                                (14.5% or 8)

Deputy Chief                                                                  (18.2% or 10)

Fire Chief                                                                     (16.4% or 9)

Answered question                                                            (55)

Skipped question                                                             (0)

Fire Agency Feedback Instrument question # 5: Scenario: You are a fire captain in charge

of developing specifications for new Wildland PPE.  You research options and make purchase

recommendations to the Fire Chief.  Your department is currently out to bid on the purchase of

new single layer Wildland PPE.  One of the competitors that bid on the contract comes up to you

at a trade show and offers you some free tickets to an upcoming professional sports playoff

game.  You should: (Choices were)

Accept the tickets because this is acceptable in my department.        (4.1% or 2)

Decline the offer and report the incident to your Fire Chief.          (95.9 or 47)

Allow a firefighter to accept the tickets                              (0%)

Other action                                                           (9 comments)

Answered question                                                      (49)

Skipped question                                                       (6)

Comments:

a) "Decline the offer without reporting to Chief."

b) "Let him know why we do not accept gratuities."

c) "Decline the offer and notify my chain of command or whom ever I report to for this

committee."

d) "City policy allows for acceptance of gifts as long as their cash value does not exceed $50.00. So it would depend upon the costs of the tickets."

e) "Decline, explain why. Then mention incident to supervisor."

f) "Decline the tickets and thank the individual for the offer. Graciously inform the individual that your organization does not allow gratuities of any form."

g) "Explain to that vendor that whether or not his intentions were so, such a transaction could be considered unethical and is not acceptable."

h) "Decline the offer and let the vendor know that our Department can't accept gratuities, especially during competitive bidding."

i) "Decline and state Dept policy."

Fire Agency Feedback Instrument question # 6. Scenario:  You are a firefighter-paramedic at an outlying fire station.  You respond to a structure fire at a liquor store located in a mutual aid area west of your jurisdiction.  The fire has been extinguished and the store owner tells your Captain to take two cases of whiskey because it's going to be condemned by the Health Department.  You Captain accepts the offer and loads the cases into the fire engine.  He instructs the engine crew that "Nobody needs to know about this."  You should: (Choices were)

Tell the Captain you don't want any part of this and let him know you'll report the incident if he doesn't put the whiskey back.                                    (92.3% or 48)

Keep quiet about the incident. It's his decision and his problem.     (1.9% or 1%)

Keep quiet, but report the incident to the Battalion Chief when

you return to quarters.                                                          (5.8% or 3)

Ask the Captain if you can have some to take home.                 (0%)

Other (Please specify)                                                       (7 comments)

Answered question                                          (52)

Skipped question                                          (3)

Comments

a) "Tell the Captain you don't want any part of it and advise the BC."

b) "In our department, the tendency would be to stay quiet about the incident, but report to a union official.  The union would handle the event by discouraging the behavior without involving administration and potential discipline."

c) "Tell the captain in private that we should not be taking this, due to perception and if he ignores you, then you will let the next officer in your chain of command know."

d) "Advise the Captain to return the goods. Inform his supervisor of the incident.  Prepare a written statement."

e) "Should also advise Captains' supervisor of the incident."

f) "Report the issue even if he returns the whiskey."

g) "Actually, a mix between the 1st and 3rd options based on the specifics and personalities involved."

Fire Agency Feedback Instrument question # 7.  Scenario:  Your Battalion Chief forgot to attend a grand opening of a new Fitness 19 facility.  You are a Captain and receive a phone call from a City Council member who wants to know where the Battalion Chief was during the event. You place the call on hold and ask the Battalion Chief what to do.  The Battalion Chief says to tell the Council Member that he was tied up on an emergency.  You know this is not true and that the Battalion Chief simply forgot to attend the grand opening.  You should:  (Choices were)

Tell the Council Member the truth.                                          (1.9% or 1)

Cover for the Battalion Chief because there was a major fire in a

neighboring community that he "could" have been involved in.    (0%)

Hand the phone to the Battalion Chief.                          (100 % or 53)

Other option                                                    (4 comments)

Answered question                                              (52)

Skipped question                                               (3)

Comments:

a) "Ensure the BC doesn't lie to the Council member."

b) "Explain to the BC that you cannot do it and that he needs to talk to the Council member."

c) "Have the BC notify the Operations Chief."

d) "Only because he is there and the Coucilperson's questions are about him in a non-investigatory manner at this point."

Fire Agency Feedback question # 8: My organization has clearly defined organizational values and norms. (Choices were)

Strongly agree                                                 (23.6% or 13)

Agree                                                          (47.3% or 26)

Disagree                                                       (23.6% or 13)

Strongly Disagree                                              (3.6% or 2)

Don't Know                                                     (1.8% or 1)

Answered question                                              55

Skipped question                                               0

Fire Agency Feedback Instrument question # 9: Organizational values and norms are passed on in my organization by: (Check all that are applicable)

Legal mandate                                                  (30.9% or 17)

| | |
|---|---|
| Story Telling | (50.9% or 28) |
| Rules and Regulations | (80.0% or 44) |
| Policies | (83.6% or 46) |
| Training | (67.3% or 37) |
| Vision Statement | (45.5% or 25) |
| Mission Statement | (61.8% or 34) |
| Answered question | (55) |
| Skipped question | (0) |

Fire Agency Feedback Instrument question # 10.  My organization has clearly defined organizational values and norms. (Choices were)

| | |
|---|---|
| Strongly Agree | (23.6% or 13) |
| Agree | (47.3% or 26) |
| Disagree | (23.6% or 13) |
| Strongly Disagree | (3.6% or 2) |
| Don't Know | (1.8% or 1) |
| Answered question | (55) |
| Skipped question | (0) |

Fire Agency Feedback Instrument question # 9.  Organizational values and norms are passed on in my organization by: (Check all that are applicable)

| | |
|---|---|
| Legal Mandate | (30.9% or 17) |
| Story Telling | (50.9% or 28) |
| Rules and Regulations | (80% or 44) |
| Policies | (83.6% or 46) |

| | |
|---|---|
| Training | (67.3% or 37) |
| Vision Statement | (45.5% or 25) |
| Mission Statement | (61.8% or 34) |
| Answered question | (55) |
| Skipped question | (0) |

Fire Agency Feedback Instrument question # 10.  Organizational values and norms are passed on in my organization by: (Check all that are applicable)

| | |
|---|---|
| Tradition | (65.5% or 36) |
| Department Motto | (9.1% or 5) |
| Department Values Statement | (38.2% or 21) |
| Ethics Policy | (49.1% or 27) |
| Specialized Certification | (5.5% or 3) |
| Mentoring | (65.5% or 36) |
| Probationary Process | (58.2% or 32) |
| Answered question | (55) |
| Skipped question | (0) |

Fire Agency Feedback Instrument question # 11.  Organizational values and norms are passed on in my organization by: (Check all that are applicable)

| | |
|---|---|
| Role Playing | (5.9% or 3) |
| Rewards for expected behavior | (11.8% or 6) |
| Ethics Monitoring | (35.3% or 18) |
| Specific industry dilemmas identified | (9.8% or 5) |
| Ethical Example | (35.3% or 18) |

| Symbols | (7.8% or 4) |
|---|---|
| Organizational Culture | (88.2% or 45) |
| Answered question | (51) |
| Skipped question | (4) |

Fire Agency Feedback Instrument question # 12: Out of the following two qualities, select one that you value the most in your organization. (Choices were)

| Fearlessness | (0%) |
|---|---|
| Honor | (100% or 53) |
| Answered question | (53) |
| Skipped question | (2) |

Fire Agency Feedback Instrument question # 13: Out of the following two qualities, select one that you value the most in your organization. (Choices were)

| Courage | (98.2% or 54) |
|---|---|
| Heroism | (1.8% or 1) |
| Answered question | (55) |
| Skipped question | (0) |

Fire Agency Feedback Instrument question # 14: Out of the following two qualities, select one that you value the most in your organization. (Choices were)

| Devotion to Duty | (56.4% or 31) |
|---|---|
| Loyalty | (43.6% or 24) |
| Answered question | (55) |
| Skipped question | (0) |

Fire Agency Feedback Instrument question # 15: Out of the following two qualities, select one

that you value the most in your organization.  (Choices were)

Accountability                                              (50% or 27)

Trustworthiness                                             (50% or 27)

Answered question                                          (55)

Skipped question                                           (0)

Fire Agency Feedback Instrument question # 16: Out of the following two qualities, select one

that you value the most in your organization.  (Choices were)

Prudence                                                   (0%)

Ethical Behavior                                           (100% or 54)

Answered question                                          (54)

Skipped question                                           (1)

Fire Agency Feedback Instrument question # 17: Out of the following two qualities, select one

that you value the most in your organization.  (Choices were)

Rewards                                                    (3.6% or 2%)

Top Management Support                                     (96.4% or 53)

Answered question                                          (55)

Skipped questions                                          (0)

Fire Agency Feedback Instrument question # 18: Out of the following two qualities, select one

that you value the most in your organization.  (Choices were)

Fairness                                                   (74.5% or 41)

Equitable Enforcement                                      (25.5% or 14)

Answered question                                          (55)

Skipped                                                           (0)

Fire Agency Feedback Instrument question # 19: From your experience, which of the following

do you feel your customers value the most? (Choices were)

Quick Response                                                    (21.8% or 12)

Helpfulness                                                       (78.2% or 43)

Answered question                                                (55)

Skipped question                                                 (0)

Fire Agency Feedback Instrument question # 20: From your experience, which of the following

do you feel your customers value the most? (Choices were)

Ability to solve problems                                        (100% or 55)

Tangibles (such as facilities and equipment)                     (0%)

Answered question                                                (55)

Skipped question                                                 (0)

Fire Agency Feedback Instrument question # 21: From your experience, which of the following

do you feel your customers value the most? (Choices were)

Reliability                                                      (48.1% or 26)

Competence                                                       (51.9% or 28)

Answered question                                                (54)

Skipped question                                                 (1)

Fire Agency Feedback Instrument question # 22: From your experience, which of the following

do you feel your customers value the most? (Choices were)

Empathy                                                          (40% or 22)

Honesty                                                          (60% or 33)

Answered question                                                                    (55)

Skipped question                                                                     (0)

Fire Agency Feedback Instrument question # 23: From your experience, which of the following

do you feel your customers value the most? (Choices were)

Customer interests placed above the organization's                    (36.4% or 20)

Trustworthiness                                                                      (63.6% or 35)

Other (Please specify)                                                               (3 comments)

Answered question                                                                    (55)

Skipped question                                                                     (0)

Comments

a) "Integrity, sincerity, real".

b) "Quick, consistent".

c) "Professionalism, promptness, and compassion".

Research Question # 5: How do fire departments differ from other organizations in the

factors outlined in the previous questions?

This question was answered by three feedback instruments and by four interviews

conducted via email or by phone.  The feedback instruments are in Appendices A, B and C and

the interview questions are included in Appendix J. For more details see Procedures section.

On July 31, 2008 the researcher interviewed Dr. George Reed. Reed's biographical

sketch is in the Procedures section. Reed (personal communication, July 31, 2008) feels that

public safety organizational values and norms are different in that first responders often accept a

level of risk that goes beyond that of other public servants.  First responders routinely deal with

dangerous environments and often assume an ethos of personal courage and sacrifice.  Because

of the environmental conditions faced, first responders need to work in teams with unique

demands and there is an ethos of cohesion, at lease in emergencies (G. Reed, personal

communication, July 31, 2008).

On August 4, 2008 the researcher interviewed Dr. Guy Adams. Adams biographical

sketch is in the Procedures section.  Adams (personal communication, August 4, 2008) feels that

public safety organizations have a higher level of service expectation but did not offer specifics.

On August 4, 2008 the researcher interviewed Dr.  Michael Macaulay.   Macaulay's

biographical sketch is included in the Procedures section.  Macaulay (personal communication,

August 4, 2008) feels that public safety organizational values and norms differ from other

organizations in the area of trust.  The public maintains a great deal of trust and sympathy for

firefighters.  Macaulay (personal communication, August 4, 2008) feels that public safety

organizations do not have to strive as hard to display sound values and ethics because of what he

calls the nobility of the fire service.  Macaulay (personal communication, August 4, 2008) feels

that the nobility serves as a beacon for the public and detracts attention away from negatives.

Other organizations do not experience this type of hero worship and do not receive as much slack

for organizational misbehavior.  The only exception to this is mismanagement of an emergency

which can quickly result in negative press and public scrutiny (M. Macaulay, personal

communication, August 4, 2008).

On September 4, 2008, the researcher interviewed Eileen Dienzo via telephone.  Dienzo's

biographical sketch is in the Procedures section.  Dienzo (personal communication, Sept. 4,

2008) does not feel that firefighters have different values and norms from other employees.

The Citizen Feedback Instrument (Appendix A) questions 6 – 17;  Fire Department

Feedback Instrument (Appendix B) questions 12 - 23 and RFD Feedback Instrument (Appendix

C) questions 9-20,  helped answer this question.

Citizen and fire respondents were asked: Out of the following two qualities, select one

that you value the most for RFD; at your organization; or at RFD.              Table 1

Selection of Qualities Valued by Citizens, Fire Departments and RFD

| Quality | Citizens | Fire Departments | RFD |
|---|---|---|---|
| Fearlessness | (20.4%) | (0%) | (10.3%) |
| Honor | (79.6%) | (100%) | (89.7%) |
| Courage | (84%) | (98.2%) | (97.4%) |
| Heroism | (16%) | (1.8%) | (2.6%) |
| Devotion to duty | (75.5%) | (56.4%) | (65.8%) |
| Loyalty | (24.5%) | (43.6%) | (34.2%) |
| Accountability | (46%) | (50%) | (33.3%) |
| Trustworthiness | (54%) | (50%) | (66.7%) |
| Prudence | (8%) | (0%) | (15.8%) |
| Ethical Behavior | (92%) | (100%) | (84.2%) |
| Rewards | (12%) | (3.6%) | (18.9%) |
| Top Management Support | (88%) | (94%) | (81.1%) |
| Fairness | (62%) | (74.5%) | (76.9%) |
| Equitable Enforcement | (38%) | (25.5%) | (23.1%) |

Note:  Comparison of citizen, fire department, and RFD respondent percentages.

Citizen respondents were asked: As a customer of Rialto Fire Department which of the

following do you value the most.  Fire Department respondents were asked: From your

experience, which of the following do you feel your customers value the most. RFD respondents

were asked: From your experience, which of the following do you feel Rialto customers value

the most.                                                                                    Table 2

Selection of Qualities Valued by Citizens, Fire Departments and RFD

| Quality | Citizens | Fire Department | RFD |
|---|---|---|---|
| Quick Response | (75.5%) | (21.8%) | (17.5%) |
| Helpfulness | (24.5%) | (78.2%) | (82.5%) |
| Reliability | (44%) | (48.1%) | (37.5%) |
| Competence | (56%) | (51.9%) | (62.5%) |
| Ability to solve problems | (80%) | (100%) | (97.5%) |
| Tangibles (facilities) | (20%) | (0%) | (2.5%) |
| Empathy | (32%) | (40%) | (70%) |
| Honesty | (68%) | (60%) | (30%) |
| Customer interests | (26.5%) | (36.4%) | (48.6%) |
| Trustworthiness | (73.5%) | (63.6%) | (51.4%) |

Note:  Comparison of citizen, fire department, and RFD respondent percentages.

## Discussion

Research Question # 1: What are the customer's and citizens' expectations of organizational

behavior?

Macaulay (personal communication, August 4, 2008) found that citizens don't care much

about public safety behavior as long as they handle emergencies professionally. Similar to this

finding, the topic of ambiguity was mentioned by MacArthur (2007), Becker (2007), Adams et. al. (2006), DHS (2005), Hagstrom (2002), Bobkiewicz et. al. (2008) and Williams (2004). The implication for RFD is that ambiguity exists, business specific research on public expectations may be helpful to the fire service, but the citizen's highest expectation is fire service competence handling emergencies. This finding will be discussed further on in the project.

Macaulay (personal communication, August 4, 2008) mentions a general distrust of public servants, except public safety in the UK.  Interestingly, morality was mentioned by Rielage (2008), Evans (2007), and Edwards (2005) to be included in ethics.  Macaulay and Lawton (2006) disagree with a bureaucratic management system that relies on efficiency and leaves no room for moral debate. Champion (2007) added that politics are not always in line with ethical decisions.  Zemke (2003) mentioned flexible blue rules and inflexible red rules.  This seems to be an attempt to deal with ambiguity.  Kane and Patapan (2006) point out that the virtue of prudence has been lost in NPM's entrepreneurial bent in public management.  The implication for all public safety is to protect the positive image that we have, in spite of the existing ambiguity that exists, by fostering positive organizational behavior.

Transparency was mentioned by Reed (personal communication, July 31, 2008) and integrity by Adams (personal communication, August 4, 2008).  In contrast, Macaulay (personal communication, August 4, 2008) feels that citizens don't care much about public safety internal behavior as long as they handle emergencies professionally.  Nelson and Economy (2005), Zablow (2006), Macaulay and Lawton (2006) and www.cities.org (2008) mentioned compliance with the laws.  Professional conduct was mentioned by www.cities.org (2008), and Compton (2003). The implication is for RFD is that there are conflicting perceptions regarding citizen

expectations of public safety but regardless of the ambiguity, organizations including RFD will not be harmed by attempts to foster professionalism.

Feedback instrument question # 3 asked the citizens what were their expectations of organizational behavior for Rialto Fire Department. The findings support Macaulay (personal communication, August 4, 2008) because the respondents mention quick response, emergency preparedness, etc. However the respondents did add other expectations beyond Macaulay (personal communication, August 4, 2008). The respondents mentioned:

(a) Honesty:  Mentioned extensively in the literature by Whitworth et. al. (2007), Harvey et. al. (2003), www.cities.org (2008), Bobkiewicz et. al. (2008), NFPA (2003), Drumm (2000), IFSTA (2004), Compton (2003), Bruegman (2006), Vancouver (2002), Becker (2004), Brunacini and Brunicini (2005), Zemke (2003), Janning and Sachs (2003), and Wilson (2003).

(b) Trustworthiness:  Mentioned in the literature by Broman (2007), Drumm (2000), Janning and Sachs (2003), Compton (2003); also similar to Reed (personal communication, July 31, 2008) and Macaulay (personal communication, August 4 2008). (c) Fairness:  Mentioned in the literature by White (2005), IFSTA (2004), Broman (2007), and Bruegman (2006).

(d) Quick response: similar to reliability (Zemke, 2003); and mentioned by Reed (personal communication July 31, 2008), Roberts (personal communication, August 4, 2008), and Macaulay (personal communication, August 4, 2008).

(d) Involvement in community: not specifically mentioned in literature

(e) Professionalism: Similar to Zemke (2003), Janning and Sachs (2003), and Tolbird (2002).

(f) Equality: Similar to fairness mentioned by Broman (2007), IFSTA (2004), and Bruegman (2006).

(g) Disaster preparedness: Similar to responsiveness to problems (Janning and Sachs, 2003), Adams (personal communication, August 4, 2008), and Macaulay (personal communication, August 4, 2008).

(h) Integrity: mentioned by Vancouver (2002), IFSTA (2004), Becker (2004), and Sargent (2006) and Adams (personal communication, August 4, 2008).

(i) Help: similar to responsiveness to problems (Zemke, 2003) and Janning and Sachs (2003), and, Dienzo (personal communication, September 4, 2008).

(j) Love for the community: similar to citizenship (Broman, 2007).

The implication of these findings for RFD indicates that emergency response is important but individual communities have additional expectations and fire departments are wise to research community expectations.

Citizen Feedback Instrument questions 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17 asked citizens to identify what they valued most as a customer of RFD.  The citizen respondents selected: (a) Helpfulness (75.5%), mentioned Zemke, (2003) and Janning and Sachs (2003); (b) ability to solve problems (80%), mentioned by Zemke (2003); (c) competence (56%), mentioned by Zemke (2003), Janning and Sachs (2003), and Tolbird (2002); (d) honesty (68%) already cited above; and (e) trustworthiness (73.5%) already cited above.

RFD feedback instrument questions 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20 asked RFD members to identify what they felt were valued the most by their customers.  The results revealed that the RFD respondents selected helpfulness (82.5%), ability to solve problems (97.5%), competence (62.5%), empathy (70%) and trustworthiness (51.4%) as the qualities they felt were most valued by their customers.  Thus, the RFD respondents selected similar choices with the exception of the empathy/honesty choice where the citizens selected honesty at (68%) and the RFD

respondents selected empathy at (70%). Empathy was mentioned by Zemke (2003).  One

explanation for the difference is that RFD stresses customer service and trains for it but has not

really addressed training on values such as honesty.  In addition, Rialto citizens may value

honesty over empathy.  This finding is applicable to any future efforts to address values in

policy, codes of conduct, mission statements or values development processes.  Honesty is a

significant finding across literature mentioned by Whitworth et. al. (2007), Harvey et. al. (2003),

www.cities.org (2008), Bobkiewicz et. al. (2008), NFPA (2003), Drumm (2000), IFSTA (2004),

Compton (2003), Bruegman (2006), Vancouver (2002), Becker (2004), Brunacini and Brunicini

(2005), Zemke (2003), Janning and Sachs (2003), and Wilson (2003). Citizens also care about

honesty. This has implications for RFD in its efforts to foster community support and meet

community expectations.

　　　Fire Department Feedback questions 19, 20, 21, 22 and 23 explored the same question

with fire agencies. The results revealed that the fire department respondents selected helpfulness

(78.2%), ability to solve problems (100%), competence (51.9%), honesty (60%), and

trustworthiness (63.6%) as the values they felt were most valued by their customers.  Hence the

fire department respondents differed from RFD respondents on question 22 (question19 in the

RFD feedback instrument) in selecting honesty, rather than empathy as value that they felt their

customers expected.  It is important to note that the mix of respondents was different in the fire

department feedback instrument because none of the respondents in the fire department feedback

instruments were below the rank of fire captain whereas, 53.7% of the RFD respondents were

below the rank of captain. This could explain a different perspective with chief officers thinking

the customers value honesty; whereas rank and file feel they value empathy. The implication of

this finding for RFD is awareness that command assumptions may differ from rank and file

considering citizen expectations.  It is imperative to have well researched, community specific

expectations and identify where differences between citizen and firefighter perceptions exist.

All three groups, Citizens, RFD respondents, and Fire Service respondents had narrow

margins on the reliability/competence choice but all three selected competence with higher

percentages. Reliability was mentioned by Zemke (2003), Janning and Sachs (2003), and Tolbird

(2002).  Response competence was alluded to by Macaulay (personal communication, August 4,

2008), Adams (personal communication, August 4, 2008) and Reed, (personal communication,

July 31, 2008). The implication for RFD is that reliability and competence are important values

to address especially in emergency response and disaster preparedness. Hurricane Katrina is a

reminder that failures can severely damage reputations in this area of public service.

Another notable difference found is that more citizen respondents selected

trustworthiness (73%) as important to them then either the fire department (63.6%) or RFD

(51.4%) respondents.  This finding has implications for future RFD organizational change efforts

and the importance of accurate assessments of community values.

Research Question # 2: What are the employees' expectations of organizational behavior?

Accountability, mentioned by Reed (personal communication, July 31, 2008, and

Macaulay, (personal communication, August 4, 2008) and also (IFSTA, 2004), (Drumm, 2000),

(Janning and Sachs, 2003), (Hagstrom, 2002), (Bruegman, 2006), (Vancouver, 2002) is related to

rule driven expectations. These  were mentioned extensively in the literature including:  (a)

Compliance with policy (Nelson and Economy, 2005), (Harvey et. al., 2003), (Zablow, 2006),

(Adams et. al., 2006) and (Broman, 2007); (b) fair and equitable enforcement of rules and

regulations (White, 2005), (Wilson , 2003), and (IFSTA, 2004); (c) integrity (IFSTA, 2004); (d)

professional conduct (www.cities.org, 2008) and (Compton, 2003); (e) accurate record keeping

and use of government power (White, 2005); (f) maintaining confidentiality (Whitworth et. al., 2007), (www.cities.org, 2008), (White, 2005), and (IAFC, 2007); and  (g) absence of harassment (Wilson, 2003). In contrast, Bruegman (2006) and Sargent (2006) offered dissenting comments that fire departments are too rule driven. The implication is to for RFD is to expect differing perspectives on rule driven solutions to organizational behavior and expectation issues.

Adams (personal communication, August 4, 2008) mentioned that organizations have varying expectations. Likewise, the literature found various expectations including: (a) Adherence to the Golden Rule (Harvey et. al., 2003) and (Drumm, 2000); (b) character (Broman, 2007); (c) obtaining employee input and buy-in (Harvey et. al., 2003), (Fitzwater, 2008), and (White, 2005); (d) maintaining personal responsibility (White, 2005), (Wilson, 2003), and (IFSTA, 2004); (e) maintaining open communication (ICMA, 2004), (Macaulay and Lawton, 2006), and (Wilson, 2003); (f) maintaining a positive workplace (www.cities.org, 2008), (IFSTA, 2004), (Compton, 2003), and (Bruegman, 2006); (g) top management support (Zablow, 2006), (IFSTA, 2004), (Wikipedia, 2006), (Janing and Sachs, 2003), (Sargent, 2006), (Hagstrom, 2002) and Reed (personal communication, July 31, 2008); (h) the value of leaving things better than we found them (Janing and Sachs, 2003); (i) value of humor (Hagstrom , 2002); and (j) personal responsibility at all levels (Broman, 2007), and (Hagstrom, 2002). These expectations were complimentary and not necessarily in conflict. The implication is that individual assessment of RFD values and norms will render information valuable to meet employee expectations and to foster positive organizational behavior.

Reed (personal communication, July 31, 2008) indicated firefighters expect: (a) Fairness, mentioned by Broman (2007), IFSTA (2004), and Bruegman (2006); (b) equity, mentioned by IFSTA (2004),White (2005), and Wilson (2003); (c) opportunities for advancement and

development, not found in the literature; (d) just compensation, not mentioned in the literature; (e) top management support, mentioned by Zablow (2006), IFSTA (2004), Wikipedia (2006), Janing and Sachs (2003), Sargent (2006), and Hagstrom (2002); (f) transparency, not found in the literature; (g) unselfish service, not specifically mentioned in the literature;(h) professionalism, mentioned by www.cities.org (2008) and Compton (2003);  and responsiveness to their concerns from top management, similar to Janning and Sachs (2003), Zemke (2003 and Tolbird (2002). The implication of these findings is that employee expectations are varied and organizationally specific. RFD can improve future cultural change efforts by addressing them from a multi-faceted approach.

Dr. Macaulay (personal communication, August 4, 2008) similar to Reed (personal communication, July 31, 2008) felt that firefighters expect: (a) Respect, mentioned by IFSTA (2004), Drumm (2000), Wilson (2003), Preciado (personal communication, March 13, 2008), Janning and Sachs (2003), Broman (2007), and Hagstrom (2002); (b) be listened to, mentioned by Janing and Sachs (2003); (c) want non-arbitrary and fair decisions, and do not like rapid or cyclical change,  similar to Broman (2007), IFSTA (2004), and Bruegman (2006); and in agreement with Dr. George Reed (personal communication, July 31, 2008). These findings are applicable values for RFD to consider in future organizational change efforts.

Dienzo (personal communication, September 4, 2008) added that, based on exit interview information, firefighters expect: (a) Better pay and benefits, also mentioned by Dr. George Reed (personal communication, July 31, 2008); and (b) larger sized departments, not mentioned in the literature or other findings.  Thus, some employee concerns can be addressed while others require creative methods to foster loyalty and employee retention.

RFD Feedback Instrument questions 9 to 15 revealed that the RFD respondents selected: (a) Honor (89.7%), mentioned by White (2005) (b) courage (97.4%), mentioned by White (2005), Janning and Sachs (2003), IFSTA (2004), and Coleman (2006); (c) devotion to duty (65.8%), mentioned by White (2005); (d) trustworthiness (66.7%), mentioned by Broman (2007), Drumm (2000), Janning and Sachs (2003), and Compton (2003); (e) ethical behavior (84.2%), mentioned by Macaulay and Lawton (2006), Broman (2007), Zablow (2006), IAFC (2007)and Hagstrom (2002); (f) top management support (81.1%), mentioned by Zablow (2006), IFSTA (2004), Wikipedia (2006), Janing and Sachs (2003), Sargent (2006), and Hagstrom (2002); and (g)  fairness (76.9%) mentioned by Broman (2007), IFSTA (2004), and Bruegman (2006),  Dr. Macaulay (personal communication, August 4, 2008, and  Dr. George Reed (personal communication, July 31, 2008). Thus, honor, courage, devotion to duty, trustworthiness, ethical behavior, top management support, and fairness are important applicable values found in the literature and selected by the respondents. This finding is applicable to organizational change efforts directed at values, norms, and organizational behavior.

The Fire Department Feedback Instruments question 12 to 18 revealed that the respondents selected: (a) Honor (100%), mentioned by White (2005); (b) courage (98.2%), mentioned by White (2005), Janning and Sachs (2003), IFSTA (2004), and Coleman (2006); (c) devotion to duty (56.4%), mentioned by White (2005); (d) accountability (50%), mentioned by IFSTA (2004), Drumm (2000), Janning and Sachs (2003), Hagstrom (2002), Bruegman (2006), and Vancouver (2002); (e) trustworthiness (50%), mentioned by Broman (2007), Drumm (2000), Janning and Sachs (2003), and Compton (2003);  (50%), (f) ethical behavior (100%), mentioned by Macaulay and Lawton (2006), Broman (2007), Zablow (2006), IAFC (2007) and Hagstrom (2002); (g) top management support (96.4%), Zablow (2006), IFSTA (2004), Wikipedia (2006),

Janing and Sachs (2003), Sargent (2006), and Hagstrom (2002); and (h) fairness (74.5%),

mentioned by Broman (2007), IFSTA (2004), Bruegman (2006),  Dr. Macaulay (personal

communication, August 4, 2008) and  Dr. George Reed (personal communication, July 31,

2008). The majority of the RFD respondents chose trustworthiness (66.7%) but the fire

department respondents chose accountability and trustworthiness equally at (50%).  One

explanation could be that the RFD respondents included more participants below captain who

may value trustworthiness over accountability. Adams (personal communication, August 4,

2008) adds insight to this discussion stating that fire departments have varying expectations, an

implication that has already been mentioned.

The wildland gear scenario question revealed that the majority of both RFD and fire

department respondents expect their members to not accept gratuities with 93.5% of the RFD

respondents choosing to decline the offer, and 95.9% of the fire department respondents

choosing to decline the offer.  One RFD respondent revealed that he/she had observed even past

officers accepting gratuities. Likewise, one fire department respondent revealed that they have a

policy that allows acceptance of gifts as long as they do not exceed $50.00 in cash value.

Conflict of interest was prevalent in the literature cited by Whitworth et. al. (2007), ICMA

(2004), www.cities.org (2008), IAFC (2007), Coleman (2006), Vancouver (2002), White (2005),

and  Sittleburg (2004). An overwhelming number of respondents in both groups recognized the

ethical dilemma and got it right.  This finding indicates that the fire service and RFD have

addressed this issue but occasionally, they get it wrong. The implication for RFD is to foster

awareness through training on a continual basis to avoid embarrassing organizational behavior.

The whiskey scenario question revealed that 92.3% of the fire department respondents

and 84.6% of the RFD respondents chose the option of informing the captain to put the whiskey

back or they would report it to a chief officer.  This is an interesting finding because the RFD

respondents had more rank and file but both groups would rather fix ethical dilemmas up front

rather than get Administration involved.  Two RFD respondents and 3 fire department

respondents chose to keep quiet and report the incident to Administration.   One RFD respondent

and two fire department respondents chose to keep quiet and not report. Zero respondents in

either group chose to accept some of the whiskey. Hence, the majority of both groups expected

their members to not accept the merchandise as a gift. This finding is in line with literature

findings of: (a) Professional conduct (www.cities.org, 2008), (Compton, 2003); (b) ethical

business conduct (Zablow, 2006), and (IAFC, 2007); and (c) integrity (Vancouver, 2002), IFSTA

(2004), Becker (2004), and Sargent (2006). Similiarly, Dr. George Reed (personal

communication, July 31, 2008) mentioned transparency.  One RFD respondent felt that the

scenario was so over the top it would never occur in Rialto.  One fire department respondent

stated that on his department, the behavior would be reported to a union official without

involving administration and discipline.  Likewise, one RFD respondent stated they would also

notify the union. These findings indicate that most firefighter respondents would prefer to solve

organizational behavior problems at the lowest level, regardless of their rank. The good news is

that the respondents recognized the dilemma.  The issue of solving problems without

administration involvement seems to be wide spread in the fire service. Given the right

circumstances, improper notification of organizational misbehavior can result in organizational

embarrassment. Awareness of this finding has implications for all fire department training

programs when addressing values and norms.

     The battalion chief lying to a council member scenario revealed that 100% of the fire

department respondents and 97.3% of the RFD respondents refused to lie for the battalion chief.

Honesty is an expectation that is widespread in both groups and cited extensively in the literature

by Whitworth et. al. (2007), Harvey et. al. (2003), www.cities.org (2008), Bobkiewicz et. al.

(2008), NFPA (2003), Drumm (2000), IFSTA (2004), Compton (2003), Bruegman (2006),

Vancouver (2002), Becker (2004), Brunacini and Brunacini (2005), Zemke (2003), Janning and

Sachs (2003), and Wilson (2003).    There were some different perspectives discovered: (a) One

RFD respondent stated he/she would follow the battalion chief's order; (b) one fire department

respondent mentioned notifying the operations chief; and (c) two respondents mentioned

mentoring the battalion chief. Organizational honesty, individual and corporate, was found to be

a huge issue with the respondents and in the business, public, and fire service literature.  This

finding has universal implications and for RFD.  Honesty is a core value.

Research Question 3.  How are organizational values and norms adopted?

Adams (personal communication, August 4, 2008), Reed (personal communication, July

31, 2008), and Macaulay, (personal communication August 4. 2008 feel that socialization tactics

are more effective.  This finding is in contrast to numerous rule driven methods including: (a)

Legal compliance (Nelson and Economy, 2005), (Zablow, 2006), (Macaulay and Lawton, 2006),

and (www.cities.org, 2008); (b) policy compliance (Nelson and Economy, 2005), (Harvey et. al.,

2003), (Zablow, 2006), (Adams et. al., 2006), (Hagstrom, 2002) and (Broman, 2007); (c) ethics

program (Stein, 2008) (Edwards, 2005), and (Zablow, 2006); (d) ethics code development

(Harvey et. al., 2003), (McDonald, 2006), (Zablow, 2006), (Coleman, 2006) and (Hagstrom,

2002); (e) zero tolerance for violations,  (Harvey et. al., 2003), (Zablow, 2006) and (DHS,

2005);(f) violation reporting mechanisms (Zablow, 2006), (ICMA, 2004), (White, 2005), and

(Vancouver, 2002); (g) rule books publishing (Stein, 2008) and Broman 2007).  As a counter-

point and in support of Adams (personal communication, August 4, 2008), Reed (personal

communication, July 31, 2008), and Macaulay, (personal communication August 4, 2008), Sole and Wilson's (2002) research found that values and norms are not adequately conveyed in written policy and codes.

Adams (personal communication, August 4, 2008), Reed (personal communication, July 31, 2008), and Macaulay, (personal communication August 4, 2008) findings in support of socialization tactics found support in the following literature citations including: (a) Fostering best industry practices (Becker, 2007); (b) provision of employee feedback (Harvey et. al., 2003); (c) fostering organizational values (Nelson and Economy, 2005), (Harvey et. al., 2003), (Sole and Wilson, 2002), and (Hagstrom, 2002); (d) values and vision development (Knowling, 2000), and (McDonald,  2006); (e) fostering corporate culture (Zablow, 2006), (Bruegman, 2006), (Stein, 2008), (CliffsNotes, 2008), and (Hagstrom, 2002); (f) establishing employee buy-in (Harvey et. al., 2003), (Fitzwater, 2008), and (White, 2005); (g) training (Harvey et. al., 2003), White, 2005), (Drumm, 2000), (Giomi, 2002), (IAFC, 2007), (IFSTA, 2004), (Evans, 2007), (Bruegman, 2006), (Broman, 2007), (Crosby, 2007), (Yo-chun Ko, 2008), and (Stein, 2008); (h) rewards for ethical behavior (Zablow, 2006) and (Hagstrom , 2002); and (i) maintaining a positive workplace environment (www.cities.org, 2008), (IFSTA, 2004), (Compton, 2003), and (Bruegman, 2006); (j) top management support (Zablow, 2006), (IFSTA, 2004), (Wikipedia, 2006), (Janing and Sachs, 2003), (Sargent, 2006), and (Hagstrom 2002); (k) use of outside consultants or sensitivity training (CliffsNotes, 2008); (l) story telling to communicate values and norms (Sole and Wilson, 2002); (f) modeling (Sole and Wilson, 2002); (m) mentoring (King et. al., 2004); (n) mnemonics (Broman, 2007); (o) symbols and tradition (Coleman, 2006); (p) socialization tactics (King et. al., 2004), (IAFC, 2007), (Crosby, 2007), (Zemke, 2003), (Janning

and Sachs, 2003); and (q) customer values (Tolbird (2002) IAFC (2007), (Crosby, 2007), (Zemke, 2003), and (Janning and Sachs, 2003).

Though the literature obviously provided numerous rule driven methods, socialization methods were also found.   In addition, the value of socialization processes in developing an organizational code of conduct was mentioned by (Zablow, 2006), (Fitzwater, 2008), (White, 2005), (Wilson, 2003), (IFSTA, 2004), (Bruegman, 2006), and (Edwards, 2005).

Dr. Reed (personal communication, July 31, 2008) added that patterns of behavior that is learned by people in an organization works to instill organizational values and norms. Dr. Reed (personal communication, July 31, 2008) feels that employees observe behavior and learn successful ways of dealing with organizational life. This finding is not inconsistent with socialization tactics cited by King et. al. (2004), IAFC (2007, and Crosby (2007).

Dr. Adams (personal communication August 4, 2008), similar to Reed (personal communication, July 31, 2008), feels that organizations communicate values and norms through their socialization tactics that exist as part of the organizational culture. This was also found in the literature mentioned above by King et. al. (2004), IAFC (2007) and Crosby (2007).

 Dr. Macaulay (personal communication, August 4, 2008) feels that values and norms emerge through years of homogenous organizational culture.  Dr. Macaulay stated he would like to say that values and norms are adopted through leadership. However, he felt that it is more realistic to view adoption of values and norms as part of group behavior expectations (M. Macaulay, personal communication, August 4, 2008).  The interesting aspect of this finding is that rule driven change efforts may not be as effective as imagined by top management. Adams et. al. (2006), Sargent (2006) and Sole and Wilson (2002) would support this finding.  Dr. Macaulay stated when change occurs; employees require a strong leader at the top. The

implication of this finding for the fire service is that settling for rule driven solutions as the quick fix to organizational misbehavior is simplistic analysis. Because of the decentralized nature of the fire service, with remote fire stations and numerous sub cultures, strong leadership must focus attention on those units. Socialization tactics such as mentoring and modeling and fostering first line supervisor cooperation will render better results.  This is applicable to RFD and challenged the researcher to not just settle for a code of conduct as the solution to organizational misbehavior.

Fire Agency Feedback Instrument Results, questions 8,9,10, and 11; and RFD Feedback Instruments Results, questions 5, 6, 7, and 8 are also applicable and discussed in the Research Question 4 Discussion. In summary, 60.9% of the fire department respondents and 67.5% of the RFD respondents felt their departments had clearly defined values and norms.  Tradition was selected significantly higher at RFD 92.3% when compared to fire department respondents at 65.5%.  Generally, both fire departments reported higher utilization of rule driven solutions, for example policies; fire department respondents at 83.6% and RFD respondents at 80.5%. However, both respondent groups also made use of training, mentoring, story telling and other socialization tactics. This usage indicates that while fire departments are rule driven (Sargent, 2006), the respondents did report significant usage of socialization type tactics.  The implication is for RFD and fire departments to be cognizant of both rule and non-rule driven methods to address organizational misbehavior. In other words, a multi-faceted, well researched and well planned organizational effort is indicated.  Just writing policy or rules without socializing change is simplistic (Sargent, 2006) and accomplishes minimal change.

Research Question # 4:  How do organizations influence employee behavior?

Reed (personal communication, July 31, 2008) mentioned Edgar Schein's notion that points to patterns of behavior that are learned by people in the organization as the method that he believes works to influence organizational behavior.  Socialization tactics mentioned by (King et. al., 2004), (IAFC, 2007) and Crosby (2007); story telling (Sole and Wilson, 2002) and (Wikipedia, 2006); and, modeling (Sole and Wilson 2002) cited are similar to this finding.

Adams (personal communication August 4, 2008 feels that organizations communicate values and norms through their socialization tactics that exist as part of the organizational culture. Socialization tactics (King et. al., 2004), (IAFC, 2007) and Crosby (2007) are an important application for RFD.

 Macaulay (personal communication, August 4, 2008) feels that values and norms emerge through years of homogenous organizational culture.  Dr. Macaulay stated he would like to say that values and norms are adopted through leadership. However, he felt that it is more realistic to view adoption of values and norms as part of group behavior expectations (M. Macaulay, personal communication, August 4, 2008).  Again, this finding seems to support socialization tactics mentioned by King et. al., (2004), IAFC (2007), and Crosby (2007).

The findings of Macaulay (personal communication, August 4, 2008), Adams (personal communication August 4, 2008) and Reed (personal communication, July 31, 2008) lean towards socialization tactics.  In contrast, the literature revealed many rule driven type methods including: (a) Legal compliance (Nelson and Economy, 2005) (Zablow, 2006) (Macaulay and Lawton, 2006), and (www.cities.org, 2008); (b) policies and procedures (Nelson and Economy, 2005) (Harvey et. al., 2003), (Zablow, 2006), (Adams et. al., 2006), (Broman, 2007), and (Macaulay and Lawton, 2006); (d) ethics program development (Stein, 2008), (Harvey et. al., 2003), (McDonald, 2006), (McDonald, 2006), (Zablow, 2006), (Coleman, 2006), (Giomi, 2002),

(Tolbird, 2002), and (Hagstrom, 2002); (e) fostering best industry practices (Becker, 2007); (f)

warnings regarding New Public Management (Kane and Patapan, 2006); and (g) cyber space

ethics (Bobkiewicz et. al., 2008).  The findings imply that leadership efforts to bring about

change in organizational culture present enormous challenges and require business specific

efforts from a multi-faceted approach.  There are no quick fixes.  In addition, more effort is

indicated in such areas as socialization, mentoring, story-telling, training and hiring practices

while, at the same time, clearly addressing legal mandates, clear expectations, rules, policies, and

standards.

Dienzo (personal communication, September 4, 2008) feels that organizations should

utilize: (a) Policies, mentioned by (Zemke (2003), Nelson and Economy (2005), Harvey et. al.

(2003), Zablow (2006), Adams et. al. (2006), Macaulay and Lawton (2006), and www.cities.org

(2008); (b) procedures, not specifically mentioned; (c)  training, mentioned extensively by

Harvey et. al. (2003), White (2005), Drumm (2000), Giomi (2002), IAFC (2007), IFSTA (2004),

Evans (2007), Bruegman (2006), Broman (2007), Crosby (2007), Yo-chun Ko (2008), and Stein

(2008); (d) mentoring, mentioned by Sole and Wilson (2002), and King et. al. (2004); and (e)

succession planning, not specifically mentioned. It is important to note that Dienzo is a human

resources practitioner which may account for her different perspective.  The implication of this

finding is awareness that while rule-driven solutions may not be as effective Sole and Wilson

(2002), they are still necessary from a human resource management point of view.

Fire Agency Feedback question # 8 asked respondents if their organization clearly

defined organizational values and norms. While 70.9% felt their organizations had well defined

values and norms 27.2% felt their organizations did not.  The RFD respondents indicated that

67.5% believed RFD had well defined values and norms and 30% felt that they were not well

defined.  Thirty-four percent of the Rialto citizens did not know.  This finding indicates that the

fire service and RFD can do better in communicating its values and norms to employees and

citizens alike.  The importance of clarifying organizational values and norms was mentioned by

Knowling (2000), Sargent (2006), Janning and Sachs (2003 and CliffsNotes (2008).

Fire Agency Feedback Instrument question # 9: Organizational values and norms are

passed on in my organization by: (Check all that are applicable)

Table 3

Methods of Passing on Organizational Values and Norms

| Method | Fire Organization | RFD | Legal |
|---|---|---|---|
| mandate | (30.9%) | (36.6%) | Storytelling |
| (50.9%) | (51.2%) | | |
| Rules and Regulations | (80%) | (73.2%) | |
| Policies | (83.6%) | (80.5%) | |
| Training | (67.3%) | (70.7%) | |
| Vision Statement | (45.5%) | (36.6%) | |
| Mission Statement | (61.8%) | (48.8%) | |

Note: This table compares results of organizational methods utilized to adopt organizational

values and norms.

The results were similar amongst the respondents.  However, the vision statement and

mission statement results indicate that awareness levels are lower at RFD.  In addition, rules and

regulations and policies received the highest selections in both groups. Sargent (2006) indicated

that the fire service is rule driven.   Wilson (2003) found that rules, regulations and policies are

not as effective in communicating values and norms as socialization tactics such as story telling

and mentoring.  Part of the value of codes of conduct were found in the process itself mentioned

by Zablow (2006), Fitzwater (2008), White (2005), Wilson (2003), IFSTA (2004), Bruegman

(2006), and Edwards (2005).  The implication again for RFD and the fire service is that, while

socialization tactics and mentoring may take more time, they are being utilized in the fire service

but awareness of organizational efforts could be increased.

Fire Agency Feedback Instrument question # 10.  Organizational values and norms are

passed on in my organization by: (Check all that are applicable)

Table 4

Methods of Passing on Organizational Values and Norms

| Method | Fire Organization | RFD |
|---|---|---|
| Tradition | (65.5%) | (92.3%) |
| Department Motto | (9.1%) | (38.5%) |
| Department Values Statement | (38.2%) | (28.2%) |
| Ethics Policy | (49.1%) | (35.9%) |
| Specialized Certification | (5.5%) | (10.3%) |
| Mentoring | (65.5%) | (76.9%) |
| Probationary Process | (58.2%) | (66.7%) |

Note: Comparison of RFD and Fire Department organizational methods utilized to adopt

organizational values and norms.

Tradition, mentioned by Coleman (2006) was selected at the highest percentage, but

much higher amongst the RFD respondents. One explanation of this difference may be that

tradition could be viewed as more important to rank and file than management in the fire service.

RFD had a higher percentage of rank and file respondents.  Another explanation is that RFD

values tradition more than the respondents.  Mentoring was the second highest selection in both

groups, followed by probationary process, which is similar to mentoring.  The implication of this

finding is that, while the fire service relies heavily on rules and regulations, (Sargent, 2006) it

also utilizes socialization tactics to influence organizational behavior. Socialization was

mentioned by King et. al. (2004), IAFC (2007), Crosby (2007), Macaulay (personal

communication, August 4, 2008), Adams (personal communication August 4, 2008) and Reed

(personal communication, July 31, 2008).   The implication for RFD is that both rule-driven and

socialization tactical solutions are necessary to address organizational behavior, norms and

values. In addition, the fire service may actually be ahead in socialization tactics as an industry.

However, assurances must be made that such socialization is positive as mentioned by

(www.cities.org 2008), IFSTA (2004), Compton (2003), and Bruegman (2006).

Fire Agency Feedback Instrument question # 11.  Organizational values and norms are passed on

in my organization by: (Check all that are applicable)

Table 5

Methods of Passing on Organizational Values and Norms

| Method | Fire Organization | RFD |
|---|---|---|
| Role Playing | (5.9%) | (17.9%) |
| Rewards for expected behavior | (11.8%) | (15.4%) |
| Ethics Monitoring | (35.3%) | (15.4%) |
| Specific industry dilemmas identified | (9.8%) | (23.1%) |
| Ethical Example | (35.3%) | (41%) |
| Symbols | (7.8%) | (7.7%) |
| Organizational Culture | (88.2%) | (76.9%) |

Note: Comparison of RFD and Fire Department organizational methods utilized to adopt organizational values and norms.

Organizational culture was, by far, the highest selection and symbols were the lowest selection amongst the respondents. Organizational culture, according to King et. al. (2004), IAFC (2007), and Crosby (2007) is passed on more effectively from socialization tactics than rules and regulations.  The above methods were found in the literature: (a) Role playing: Crosby (2007); (b) rewards for expected behavior (Zablow, 2006) and (Hagstrom, 2002); (c) specific industry dilemmas identified and socialized (Harvey et. al. 2003), Macaulay and Lawton (2006), Bruegman (2006); (d) Symbols (Coleman 2006) and Zablow (2006); and (e) organizational culture (CliffsNotes, 2008), (Zablow 2006), (Broman (2007), (Crosby, 2007), (Wikipedia (2006), Hagstrom (2002),(www.cities.org, 2008), (IFSTA (2004), (Compton, 2003), and Bruegman (2006).  These findings imply that organizational change efforts in Rialto have many effective

tools available to utilize which transcend traditional rule driven solutions common to the fire

service (Sargent, 2006).

Fire Agency Feedback Instrument question 5 and RFD Feedback Instrument question 2,

the Wildland PPE specification scenario question revealed that fire departments try to deal with

conflict of interest situations via chain of command notification and refusal of gifts. The fire

department respondents chose to decline the offer and report it via chain of command 95.9% of

the time. RFD respondents chose likewise at 93.5%.   This is an encouraging find.  However, it is

not encouraging that some respondents, including chief officers indicated accepting gifts from

vendors does occur.  The implication of this finding is applicable to RFD because zero tolerance

is the norm to avoid organizational trouble in this area of business.

Fire Agency Feedback Instrument question 6 and RFD Feedback Instrument question 3,

the whiskey scenario question, revealed that fire departments try to deal with this type of

scenario at the lowest level.  Interestingly, both groups Fire Department respondents (92.3%) and

RFD respondents (84.6%) chose to try and solve the issue upfront, at the lowest level, without

reporting.  This indicates that fire service culture has a strong informal compliance system

outside the formal discipline system. Dr. Reed (personal communication, July 31, 2008), Dr.

Adams (personal communication, August 4, 2008), and Macaulay (personal communication,

August 4, 2008), King et. al. (2004), IAFC (2007), and Crosby (2007) all mention socialization

tactics.  It is important to note that any organizational change effort must face overcoming

socialization obstacles. In addition, a strong informal compliance system can backfire as alluded

to by Adams et. al. (2006), Hagstrom (2002), and Williams (2003). The brotherhood can

outdistance the ethics given the right sequence of events (Adams et. al. (2006).

Fire Department Feedback question 7 and RFD Feedback Question 4 involved a Battalion Chief honesty issue.  Overwhelmingly, 97.3% of the RFD respondents and 100% of the Fire Department respondents chose to hand the phone to the battalion chief.  Clearly, honesty has a universal application as a relevant core value to be fostered in any organization.

Research Question # 5: How do fire departments differ from other organizations in the factors outlined in the previous questions?

Reed (personal communication, July 31, 2008) feels that public safety organizational values and norms are different because first responders often accept a level of risk that goes beyond that of other public servants.  First responders routinely deal with dangerous environments and often assume an ethos of personal courage and sacrifice.  Because of the environmental conditions faced, first responders need to work in teams with unique demands and there is an ethos of cohesion, at lease in emergencies (G. Reed, personal communication, July 31, 2008). This finding supports the literature cited that firefighters value qualities such as honor, (White, 2005), do no harm (Drumm 2000), bravery (Coleman, 2006), devotion to duty (White, 2005), courage (Coleman, 2006), (White, 2005), and heroism (IFSTA, 2004), and (Janing and Sachs, 2003). This finding is applicable to RFD in that awareness of this difference is helpful for leadership when they address city wide organizational change efforts. Similarly, Dr. Adams (personal communication, August 4, 2008) feels that public safety organizations have a higher level of service expectation but did not offer specifics.

Dr. Macaulay (personal communication, August 4, 2008) feels that public safety organizational values and norms differ from other organizations in the area of trust.  The public maintains a great deal of trust and sympathy for firefighters.  Dr. Macaulay (personal communication, August 4, 2008) feels that public safety organizations do not have to strive as

hard to display sound values and ethics because of what he calls the nobility of the fire service. Macaulay (personal communication, August 4, 2008) feels that the nobility serves as a beacon for the public and detracts attention away from negatives.  Other organizations do not experience this type of hero worship and do not receive as much slack for organizational misbehavior.

The only exception to this nobility beacon is mismanagement of an emergency which can quickly result in negative press and public scrutiny (M. Macaulay, personal communication, August 4, 2008). This is perhaps, the most controversial and significant finding in the research. It challenges conventional wisdom.  Many fire chiefs in California are fully aware of the hero worship that occurs after the annual wildland –urban-interface fires.  The application to RFD and the fire service is that efforts to adopt or change values and norms can be more challenging in the fire service than other entities because of the public trust and sympathy that firefighters receive. The application is to expect much opposition to organizational change efforts because the public, and therefore politicians, do not support wide sweeping change efforts unless firefighters have failed in emergency response (Macaulay, personal communication, August 4, 2008). Fire service literature seems to support this finding where  the following values were found mentioned including: (a) honor, (White, 2005); (b) the do no harm concept, Drumm (2000); (c) bravery, Coleman (2006);  and (d) devotion to duty, White (2005); and  courage, Coleman (2006), White (2005) and Janing and Sachs (2003).

Fearlessness/Honor:  Though the majority of Citizen (79.6%), Fire Department (100%), and RFD (89.7%) respondents selected honor respectively, 20.4% of the citizens selected fearlessness as a quality they value. Fearlessness was mentioned in the literature by Macaulay and Lawton (2006). Honor was mentioned by White (2005). The application of this finding for RFD is awareness that some citizens have an expectation of fearlessness.

Courage/Heroism: Though the majority of Citizen (84%), Fire Department (98.2%) and RFD (97.4%) respondents selected courage respectively, 16% of the citizen respondents selected heroism. Courage was found in the literature, mentioned by White (2005), Janning and Sachs (2003), IFSTA (2004), and Coleman (2006). IFSTA (2004) mentioned heroism.  The implication for RFD is that it has done a good job of educating the respondents that they don't need any heroes but there are some citizens who expect heroism.  In addition, some firefighter respondents selected heroism and it does not take many to generate a fire service fatality, an application worth consideration. The implication of this finding is awareness.

Devotion to Duty/Loyalty: When examining devotion to duty over loyalty, the citizen respondents selected highest value (75.5%) for devotion to duty.  This finding indicates that the Fire Department respondents may underestimate the importance of devotion to duty to citizens or they have a different perspective. Devotion to duty was mentioned by White (2005) and similar to dedication IFSTA, (2004) and Becker (2004).  Loyalty was mentioned by IFSTA (2004), Compton (2003), Janning and Sachs (2003), Becker (2004), Coleman (2006), and Sargent (2006).   This finding is applicable to RFD because conventional wisdom assumed by firefighters regarding citizens can be mistaken.

Accountability/Trustworthiness received very close selections indicating that the citizen respondents and Fire Department respondents had difficulty choosing between accountability and trustworthiness.  The RFD respondents selected trustworthiness 66.7% indicating they valued it more than accountability.  One explanation for this difference is that accountability may be perceived as directed more towards rank and file and the RFD respondents had more rank and file participants. The application of this finding is for command to address organizational perceptions regarding accountability.   In addition, citizens may expect more accountability than

rank and file.  This finding conflicts with Macaulay (personal communication, August 4, 2008).

Accountability is mentioned in the literature by IFSTA (2004), Drumm (2000), Janning and

Sachs (2003), Hagstrom (2002), Bruegman (2006), and Vancouver (2002). Trustworthiness was

mentioned by Broman (2007), Drumm (2000), Janning and Sachs (2003), and Compton (2003).

Prudence/Ethical Behavior:  The citizen, fire department and RFD respondents all

selected ethical behavior over prudence.  The RFD respondents had the highest selection for

prudence (15.8%).  This finding is consistent with Kane and Patapan's (2006) finding that

prudence is a lost virtue in public service. RFD can benefit from awareness of this value.

Rewards/Top Management Support: Eighty-eight percent of the citizens, 94.6% of the

fire department respondents and 81.1% of the RFD respondents selected top management

support as a value important to them. Interestingly, the RFD respondents had the lowest selection

for top management support and the highest selection for rewards at 18.9%.  This finding may

indicate that rank and file care more about rewards than citizens or top management.  Also, top

management support is important to all three groups.  Rewards were mentioned by Zablow

(2006), and Edwards (2005). Top management support was mentioned by Zablow (2006),

IFSTA (2004), Wikipedia (2006), Janning and Sachs (2003), Sargent (2006), and Hagstrom

(2002).  The application of this finding confirms that top management support is an important

value and perception to address in organizational change efforts.

Fairness/Equitable Enforcement: The majority of citizen (62%), Fire Department (74.5%,

and RFD (76.9%) respondents selected fairness as an important quality they value.  However,

citizens had a higher expectation of equitable enforcement (38%) when compared to Fire

Department (25.5%) or RFD (23.1%).  Awareness that citizens are concerned about perceptions

of fairness is applicable to RFD.

When examining customer values, more variance was discovered between citizen and fire respondents. For example, 75.5% of the citizen respondents selected quick response over helpfulness (24.5%). Conversely, 78.2% of the Fire Department respondents and 82.5% of the RFD respondents selected helpfulness. This was a surprising finding. One explanation is that customers expect quick response but not necessarily helpfulness. This finding was supported by Roberts (personal communication, September 3, 2008), Reed (personal communication, July 31, 2008) and Adams (personal communication, August 4, 2008). The implication is that customers may appreciate helpfulness from a fire agency but not expect it.

Reliability/Competence was a close expectation of all three groups. Reliability was mentioned by Harvey et. al. (2003). Competence was mentioned by Zemke (2003), Janning and Sachs (2003), and Tolbird (2002). The implication of this finding is awareness that both are important to firefighters, citizens and RFD members.

Ability to solve problems/ Tangibles: Citizens (80%), Fire Departments (100%, and RFD (97.5%) respondents selected ability to solve problems. Tangibles received the highest selection from citizens (20%). Hence, while all three groups selected ability to solve problems, some citizens do notice tangibles. Though funding may be an issue, the application of how to address response times or tangibles is not complicated.

Empathy/Honesty: This also had a large variance between the citizen and RFD respondents. Empathy was selected by the RFD respondents 70% of the time whereas 68% of the citizen respondents selected honesty. Empathy was mentioned by Zemke (2003), Janning and Sachs (2003), and King et. al. (2004). Honesty was mentioned extensively by Whitworth et. a. (2007), Harvey et. al. (2003), www.cities.org (2008), Bobkiewicz et. al. (2008), NFPA (2003), Drumm (2003), IFSTA (2004), Compton (2003), Bruegman (2006), Vancouver (2002, Becker

(2004), Brunacini and Brunacini (2005), Zemke (2003), Janning and Sachs (2003), and Wilson

(2003).  The implication to RFD is awareness that a discrepancy exists and assumptions of

customer values may not always be in line with the facts.  Honesty is a strongly desired citizen

value.

Customer Interests placed above the City's/ Trustworthiness: Citizens (73.5%) selected

trustworthiness whereas RFD respondents selected it at 51.4%.  This finding indicates that

citizen respondents value trustworthiness over their own interests, and perhaps more that the

RFD respondents perceive that they do.  The implication is to have better research to act on when

performing organizational change efforts. Customer interests were mentioned by Janning and

Sachs (2003).

<div align="center">Recommendations</div>

- RFD needs to foster and develop honor, courage, devotion to duty,

  trustworthiness, ethical behavior, fairness and top management support. The best

  method to accomplish these is to utilize socialization tactics.

- Honesty is a must. No value is more supported by the research findings than this

  one.

- A comprehensive ethics training program is valuable. To address values, norms,

  and organizational misbehavior, the researcher recommends use of mentoring,

  role playing, ethical example, story telling, vision statement, values statement and

  mission statement. These must be ingrained in the training program. These

  recommendations will be forwarded to the Training Officer immediately.

  Hopefully, RFD can address this training need by July, 2009.

- Differing perceptions of command/rank and file values exist making it essential to have well researched data when addressing organizational behavior, values and norms.  Such research must be agency, and business specific.  The researcher recommends an audit of values, comparison, and inclusion into a newly developed values statement. A year should be allotted to accomplish this.

- Top management, Local 3688, and Rank and File must work together to adopt organizational values, norms and address behavior issues.  The researcher recommends the development of a new values statement, vision statement, mission statement, and code of conduct during 2009. It must be realized that part the value in developing these is not rule driven but related to the socialization process which will occur with the groups working together to develop these items.

- Reliability, competence and quick response is a huge customer expectation that is universal and requires attention. The research clearly indicates that readiness to respond issue can torpedo fire department standings quicker than any issue.  The recommendation to RFD is for Command to not forget RFD's primary mission. The researcher recommends RFD complete an audit of its disaster preparedness/ readiness to respond capability by July of 2009.

- Employees especially care about issues of fairness, want non arbitrary decisions, desire to be listened to, desire respect, responsiveness, and top management support. Command must foster these regardless of reciprocity.

- Rules, policies, procedures and codes are necessary to address ambiguity, but organizational behavior, values and norms issues are not solved by rule driven solutions.  Take the time and utilize socialization tactics.

- Citizens expect honesty, trustworthiness, fairness, quick response, professionalism, disaster preparedness, and integrity. Foster these values in organizational change efforts.

- Mentor officers on principles of when to report behavior problems via the chain of command and when to address them under the radar.  The Fire Service can't fight the informal compliance system.  It is engrained even up to top management positions.  Socialize this into positive energy and make it work for, and not against, the organization.  Fighting organizational behavior problems with rules is a simplistic quick fix that goes against the decentralized nature of fire service organizational structure.

- Rules without relationship breed rebellion; ambiguity without rules breeds organizational misbehavior; both are necessary and complimentary if top management sees the value of using socialization tactics in rule and policy development. Combine them in process and realize nothing is a quick fix. Rules versus socialization processes are not either-or but both solutions. Think big picture, down-board and include both in change efforts of the future. The plan should be RFD business specific and multi-faceted.

- Ambiguity exists and there is value in identifying gray areas specific to your fire agency and addressing them.  The researcher recommends that RFD identify its' gray areas and addresses them through a mentorship program.  This will take at least one year and should be accomplished through the Training division.

Research Recommendations

- Research the topic of socialization tactics versus rule driven tactics to address organizational rules, values, norms organizational culture and organizational misbehavior.

- Research what expectations local citizens have of their respective fire agencies.

- Research whether citizens really care about internal behavior as much as fire service professionals think they do.

- Research the customer service values of empathy versus honesty.

References

Adams, G. B., Balfour, D. L., and Reed, G. E. (2006).  Abu ghraib, administrative evil, and

moral inversion: The value of putting cruelty first.  *Public Administrative Review*, 66

(5), 680-691.

American Psychological Association (2002). *Publication Manual of the American

Psychological Association, (fifth edition).*  Washington DC: Author.

Becker, D. S. (2007). The age of moral ambiguity.   *JEMS.*  Retrieved June 8, 2007 from:

http://www.jems.com/news_and_articles/columns/Becker.

Becker, D. S. (2004). Character of an ethical boss. *JEMS.* Retrieved June 17, 2008 from:

http://www.jems.com/news_and_articles/columns/Becker.

Bobkiewicz, W., Hanley, R.A., Martello, M., Calonne, A., and Fleishman, D. (2008). Taking

the bite out of blogs: Ethics in cyberspace. *Western City.* April.

Bruegman (2006).  Ethics in the fire service. *Chief fire officer's desk reference*.

Fairfax, VA: International Association of Fire Chiefs.

Brunacini, A.  and N. Brunacini, (2005).  *The anatomy and physiology of leadership.*

Peoria, Arizona. Across the Street Productions, Inc.

Broman, J. (2007). Character counts: Discuss ethical behavior and decision making with your

team. *FireRescue Magazine.* 25 (4)112-115.

Campion, M. (2007). Core principles drive our public safety mission. *Minnesota Fire Chief.* 44

(2) p. 6.

CliffsNotes, (2008). Principles of management: Opposition to organizational changes.

RetrievedJune12from:

http://www.cliffsnotes.com/WileyCDA/CliffsReviewTopic.

Compton, D. (2003). Leadership for today and tomorrow. *The fire chief's handbook, sixth edition* (pp.205-229) Tulsa, Oklahoma, PennWell Corporation.

Coleman, R. J. (2006): When in Doubt, Don't. *Chief's clipboard: 20 years of ronny j. coleman.* (pp.54-56) Boston: Jones and Bartlett Publishers, Inc.

Coleman, R. J. (2006): The badge. *Chief's clipboard: 20 years of ronny j. coleman. (pp 57-58)* Boston: Jones and Bartlett Publishers, Inc.

Crosby, F. (2007).  The real meaning of brotherhood. *Fire Engineering.* 160 (7) 107-110.

Department of Homeland Security [DHS] (2005). *DHS needs to improve ethics-related management controls for the science and technology directorate*. Retrieved on June 12, 2008 from: www.gao.gov.

Drumm, H. (2000). Identifying the ethical climate of the city of markham fire department. (Report N. 21929) Emmitsburg, MD: National Fire Academy.

Edwards, S.T. (2005). *Fire service personnel management, second edition.* (pp.9-16)Upper Saddle River, New Jersey. Pearson/Prentice Hall.

Evans, B. (2007). Ethical emts reduce customer complaints. *Firechief.* Retrieved June 17  from: http://firechief.com/ems/firefighting_ethical_emts_reduce/index.html.

Federal Emergency Management Agency [FEMA] (2005). *Executive leadership* (5th ed.). National Fire Academy. Emmitsburg, MD: Author.

Federal Emergency Management Agency [FEMA] (2004). *Executive development R123 research self-study workbook.* National Fire Academy. Emmitsburg, MD: Author.

Fitzwater, T. L. (2008). *How to adopt a code of ethics.* Institute for Local Government. Retrieved on June 9, 2008 from: http://www.cacities.org/index.jsp?displaytype.

Giomi, R. S. (2002). *Ethics and the Carson city fire department.* (Report No.13093)

    Emmitsburg, MD: National Fire Academy.

Harvey, E., Cottrell D., and Lucia, A., (2003). *The leadership secrets of santa claus: How*

    *To get big things done in your workshop all year long*. Dallas. (pp.3-80) The Walk the

    Talk Company.

Hagstrom, J. (2002). Ethics in management: Asset or liability? *Public Safety*

    *Communications.* March.

International Association of Fire Chiefs (IAFC) [2007].  *Fire chiefs code of ethics.*

    Retrieved June 9, 2008 from: http://www.iafc.org/displaycommon.cfm?an=5.

International City/County Management Association [ICMA] (2004). *ICMA code of ethics*

    *with guidelines*. ICMA: Author.

International Fire Service Training Association [IFSTA] (2004). *Chief officer.*  Stillwater,

    OK. Fire Protection Publications.

Janing and Sachs (2003). Achieving excellence in the fire service. Upper Saddle River, New

    Jersey (pp 19-33). Prentice Hall.

Kane, J. and Patapan (2006). In search of prudence: The hidden problem of managerial reform.

    *Public Administration Review.* 66 (5) 711-724.

King, R. C., Xiqa, W., Quick, J. C., and Sethi, V. (2004). *Socialization and organizational*

    *outcomes of information technology professionals.* (Emerald University) Retrieved on

    June 14 2008 from: http://www.emeraldinsight.com/insight/viewContent.

Knowling, R. (2000). Why vision matters. Jossey-Bass. San Francisco: Author.

Lohr, J.M., Devilly, G. J., Lilienfeld, S. O., Olalunji, B. O. (2006). First do no harm, and  then do

    some good: Science and professional responsibility in the response to disaster and

    trauma. *Behavior Therapist.* 29 (6) 5 131-135.

MacArthur, J. (2007). The truth war: Fighting for certainty in an age of deception. Dallas:

    Thomas Nelson.

Macaulay, M., and Lawton, A. (2006). From virtue to competence: Changing the principles of

    public service. *Public Administration Review.* 66 (5) 702-710.

MacDonald, C. (2006). *Considerations for writing a code of ethics.*  Retrieved June 11,

    2008 from: http://www.ethicsweb .ca/codes/writing -a-code-of-ethics.htm.

National Fire Protection Association [NFPA] (2003). National officer professional

    qualifications. (NFPA Standard 1021-13 A.1.3.) Quincy, MA: Author

Nelson, B., and Economy, P. (2005). *The management bible.* Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley

    and Sons' Inc.

Rielage, R. R. (2008).  Ethics exam. [Electronic version]. *Firechief.*  52 (1) 38-41.

Sargent, C. (2006).  From buddy to boss: Effective fire service leadership. Tulsa OK

    (pp. 15-337): Penwell Corporation.

Sole, D. and Wilson, D. (2002). *Storytelling in organizations: The power and traps of using*

    *stories to share knowledge in organizations.* (Harvard Graduate School of

    Education)Retrieved June 12, 2008 from:

    http://lila.pz.harvard.edu_upload/lib/ACF14F3pdf.

Stein, P. (2008). Sharing organizational values and ethics*.  The california fire service.*

    April issue, 18-19.

Stittleburg, P.C. (2004).  Trip to look at truck nets ethical trouble. *Fire Chief.* Retrieved June 13,

    2008 from: http://firechief.com/leadership/management-fire administration.

Tolbird, T. G. (2002).  *Analyzing the need for a code of ethics.*  (Report No 33086)

    Emmitsburg, MD: National Fire Academy.

Vancouver (2002). City of Vancouver Washington employment policies. Retrieved June 8 from

    www.vancouver.com/cityofvancouver/employmentpolicies/.

Webster's, (2005). *Webster's II new college dictionary: Third edition*. Houghton Mifflin.

    Boston: Author.

White, W. W. (2005).  *Reframing ethics for sacramento area firefighters: Honoring

    public trust and confidence.* (Report No. 38709) Emmitsburg, MD: National Fire

    Academy.

Whiteley, W. (2002). *The american fire service: A profession?*  (Report N. 34649)

    Emmitsburg, MD: National Fire Academy.

Whitworth, L., Kimsey-House, K., Kimsey-House, H. Sandahl, P. (2007). *Co-active

    coaching: New skills for coaching people toward success in work and life.  Second

    Edition.* Davies-Black Publishing: Mountain View, CA.

Wikipedia (2006). Organizational culture. Retrieved on June 11, 2008 from:

    http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Organizational culture.

Williams, S. (2004): Clarifying and applying personal values: Priorities and integrity.

    Retrieved June 14, 2008 from:

    http://www.wright.edu/scott.williams/leaderletter/values.htm.

Wilmoth, Janet (2003).  On ethics and elephants. [Electronic version] *Firechief.*  47(7) 4-5.

Wilson, J. (2003). *Developing and implementing a code of conduct for Vashon island fire and rescue.* (Report No. 36339)  Emmitsburg, MD: National Fire Academy.

www.cacities.org, (2008). Sample Cods of Ethics for Public Service – Councils. Retrieved June 11, 2008 from: http://www.cacities.org.

Yu-chun Ko, B. (2008). Value added. *Fire Risk Management.* April 48-49.

Zablow, R. J. (2006). Creating and sustaining the ethical workplace. *Risk Management.* 53 (9) 26-29.

Zemke, R. (2003). *Delivering knock you socks off service. Third edition.* AMACOM. New York.

Zipskinny, (2008). Zipskinny demographic information for rialto california. Retrieved on August 15 from: http://zipskinny.com/indes.php?zip=92376.